

178
10
REFLECTIONS

ON THE

RELATION

OF THE

ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Lately Printed at

OXFORD.

By D^r G. PART I. *Barnet*

AMSTERDAM.

Printed for P. Bleau. 1688.

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

RELATION

OF THE

ENGLISH REFORMATION

Lately Printed at

OXFORD.

PART I.

AMSTERDAM

Printed by J. Blaeu, 1683.

REFLECTIONS
ON THE
RELATION
OF THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION, &c.

The First Part.

THE INTRODUCTION.

WE have been long in Expectation of some extraordinary *Productions* of the Eminent Convert of *Oxford*. His Age, his Learning, and the present Con-juncture hath raised that Expectation very high; and tho' the ill success of his Discourses concerning the Presence in the Sacrament, and the Adoration of it, hath sunk his Reputation to a great Degree; it having appeared that he neither writes exactly, nor sincerely, which hath lessened him much in the Opinion of those, who expected great things from him. Yet it was thought that matters of History would succeed better in his hand; for it hath been long believed, that he had examined those Tran-sactions very critically; so that when I heard that he had undertaken this Subject, I expected great Discoveries from him, and fancied that instead of *Extracts* out of *Fuller* and *Hoylin*, we should have found *Re-wards*, *Originals*, *Papers*, and the *Cotton-Library*, often cited. So it may be easily apprehended how much I was surprised, when I found a Book of such a Volume, in which there was not the least Discovery of any new matters of Fact; and that there was nothing in it, but a tedious Repetition (very ill-expressed in rough English) of Arguments that have been over and over again, both made and refuted; together with a representation of the state of Affairs in the last Age; that was partly defective,

Reflections on the Relation

and partly false. It seemed strange to me at first view, to see so large a Book writ and printed eight years after that Dr. *Burnet's* History of the Reformation had appeared, without its taking the least notice of that Work, which hath been so well received, so much read, and which seems to be so well confirmed by the Proofs that accompany it, that few Books of History have gained a more general Reputation than it hath done; and as none of the *Roman* Communion have been able hitherto, to say any thing for the Disparagement of that Work, except Mr. *Varillas*; so he hath been so severely exposed by the Dr. that this attempt hath raised its Credit, instead of lessening of it.

P. 82. ad finem

It is true, This Book seems to be a part of a great Work, and to have been writ many years ago. For as this appears in many Parts of it, so more remarkably in one Passage, that shews it was written in the interval between His *Late Majesty's* being re-established in his Throne, and the Restoration of Bishops; and therefore, when this Book was writ, the Author could not vouch other Historians, than such as had then appeared: Yet, since the printing of it was delayed so long; and since it is believed, that the Author and the Publisher is the same person, he might have given himself the trouble to have reviewed his Work, or at least to have added some Appendix relating to that more copious and authentic Account which Dr. *Burnet* hath given us of our Reformation. For if the Dr. hath deceived the World by a false Representation of Matters; yet it must be confessed, that he hath done it with so good a Grace, and with such appearances of Sincerity, and of proving what he relates, and that both our Country men and Forreigners have read that Work so much (as appears by the several Impressions at home, and the several Translations that have been printed beyond Seas) that it was too great an Omission in the Author of this Recital, if he be still alive, that he hath never mentioned that History, nor said any thing to mine the Reputation it hath gained.

I am, I confess, much inclined to believe, that he who hath published this Book, could not have writ it. For as there is nothing in it that answers the Reputation he hath in the World; so the time of writing it, seems a Demonstration that he cannot be the Author of it: For what Opinion can we have of a mans Conscience, of his Probity, or his Honour, that could write such a Book against the *Reformation*, and the Church of *England* in the year 1660. and yet could continue in the Communion of our Church, concerning not only in the use of our *Sacraments*, but mixing with us in the Holy Sacrament twenty five years after this! Such a Criminal Compliance hath so many foul Characters

acters upon it, that after all the Charity to which a man can carry his thoughts, he can scarce know how to have one good thought of a person capable of so black and such a long-continued dissimulation, both towards God and Man. Whether Oaths and Subscriptions have not come in likewise to enhance the guilt of so horrid a Dissimulation, I do not know; but even tho that hath not been in the case, God and Man hath been sufficiently mocked. This is that which makes me very unwilling to believe that the Author of this Book could continue in all the Acts of visible Communion with this Church, so many years after he writ it; tho I confess he speaks so softly, and with so little Detestation of the compliance of the Popish Clergy in Edward the 6th's time, that this looks too like a man that was resolved to venture on the same guilt: for he tells us in his harsh Stile, That the perpetual outward compliance of some other Bishops contrarily affected, since there preceded before it Penalties and Fears, and the seeing of the Prime Bishops to be imprisoned and ejected for standing out, is far from an authentical Consent, and unjustly reckoned as such. For tho none can know mens Hearts, but by their outward appearances, yet where mens Votes are asked, after Penalties, Imprisonments of others, Threats, &c. which are so strong motives of Dissimulation, Now all that conform in these, are to be presumed Complicers, and none free Voters. And afterwards without expressing any horror at it, he owns, That many of the inferior Clergy remained still of the old Religion; which he goes about to prove by several Reasons. And yet after all this, there was nothing to be apprehended in K. Edward's days, by such of the Clergy as would not receive the Reformation, but the loss of their Benefices; which (if we are not mistaken in the Man) our Author felt to be such a strong motive of Dissimulation, that he resolved to be overcome by it. If a single Act of impious Worship against a mans Conscience, was thought so heinous a crime by the Primitive Church, that it could not be expiated, but by a Penitence of many years continuance; then certainly, the same Sin repeated in the course of so many years, against such clear Convictions of Conscience, must be confessed to be so heinous a Transgression, that according to the Spirit of the Primitive Times, such an Offender could have expected no other Grace, but to obtain the Peace of the Church in his last Agonies. To see a man change is natural, especially where a present Interest is the motive; but it is a degree of Impiety, of which one would hope there are few men capable to live so long, and so solemnly both to God and man. But I come now to look a little more narrowly into the matter of this Treatise.

I will not at all engage my self to examine a great many Passages that

From p. 140.

Page 141.

Reflections on the Relation

are cited in it, out of some of our Authors, and in particular out of *Dr. Heylin*, and *Mr. Thorndike*: When we object to those of the Church of *Rome* some things out of *Erasmus* or *Cassander*; or for Historical Matters, when we cite *P. Paul* or *Tinamus*; we know with how much neglect they put by these Authorities, as if they were not concerned in them; tho' these Persons lived and dyed in the Visible Communion of their Church, And I do not see why we may not take the same liberty with such Writers, that tho' they have been in Communion with our Church, yet have it seems continued in it with some difficulty. And it will not appear very strange if at the end of our *Civil Wars* those Persons, who saw the ill effects of some ill Principles very apparently, were carried by the impressions which those Confusions made upon them, to oppose those disorders by an over-bending of their notions to the other Extrem. For this is an excess to which the humane nature is so liable, that it were a wonder if all Writers, especially men of warm Tempers, that had been sower'd by ill usage, had been preserved from it; so that I will wholly wave all that he cites from these or any others of our Authors, and will come to the matters themselves.

C H A P. I.

Of the Importance of those Matters Objected to the Reformation, supposing them all true.

THE Disputes that we had with the Church of *Rome* were at first managed with more sincerity by our Adversaries, than they have been of late; They justified their Church in those Points for which we accused her, and objected the strongest things they could to ours; but when they felt their Cause too weak to be maintained by fair methods, then they betook themselves to others that were indeed less sincere, but yet were more apt to make impressions on weak minds. In *France*, and among us, Three new Methods have appeared of late Years. The First was to take off men from entering into the merits of the Cause, and to prepossess them with such Prejudices against the Reformation, as might lead them to condemn it without examining: To a discerning mind this method furnishes the strongest of all prejudices against those who use it; this shews such a distrust of the Cause it self, and it discovers it self so plainly to be a trick, that it gives every man a just ground of indignation against those who fly to it: Besides, that it affords a good Plea to all

all men to continue in the Religion in which they were born and bred, without hearkning to any new discoveries; for if the Grounds upon which the Reformation was made, were good, it signifies little to an Enquirer into Truth, whether this Work was set on foot, and managed with all the exactness and regularity that might have been desired, or not. Truth is always Truth, from what hand soever it comes; and the right way to find it out, is to free our minds from all prejudices, that so we may examine matters with unprepossessed understandings.

A Second Method is to persuade the World that we have not yet understood one another; that *Papery* hath only appeared odious, because it was *Misrepresented* to the world in false colours, but that it will be found to be quite another thing if it is truly *represented*. The *Bishop of Meaux* had the honour to begin this piece of *Legerdemain*; our men of the *Mission* here have too slender a stock of their own, and therefore they give us the *French Made* in Controversie, as well as our Gallants do it in Cloaths; so they have thought to do wondrous feats with this method of *Representing*; but the want of sincerity of that Prelate, in this as well as in other things, hath been so evidently made out, that if some men had not a secret that makes them proof against all discoveries, he would be a little out of Countenance; and our *Representers* here are so exposed, that nothing is wanting for their conviction, but a sense of that shame with which they have been covered; it is indeed a strange piece of confidence in men, to come and offer to convince the World, That after Disputes of 150 years continuance, neither side hath understood the state of the Controversie: And tho' the same Decrees of Councils, and the same Forms of Worship are still received; yet all these things must of a sudden so change their nature, that in defiance of all that, which upon other occasions, they lay in behalf of *Tradition*, a new discovery should be made, giving us new senses of all those things; but whatsoever success that Book may have had, where a plundering Army managed the Argument, yet it is become now as ridiculous here, as it is pretended to have been successful beyond Sea.

A Third Method is the setting up the Credit of *Oral Tradition*, not upon the Authority of some passages of Scripture, but upon this general Topic, that one Age must needs have delivered the same Faith to the succeeding Age, that it has received from that which went before it; and by consequence, that we must have in the present Age, the same Doctrine which the Apostles delivered at first, 17 Ages ago. It was found, That the Authority of the Church could not well be founded on passages of Scripture, for then we must be allowed first to believe the Scripture, and

its Authority and Cennineness, and then to inquire into the meaning of those Passages, and to examine to which of all the different Churches that are in the world, they do belong. Now it was apparent, That if it were once allowed, that we may carry our enquiries so far as to be able to settle our selves in these points, then this Infalible Authority is not so necessary to us, as they would make us believe, since we are supposed to have found good proofs for believing the Scriptures, and for discovering the true meaning of the hardest passages in them, without its help. Now this would spoil all, and throw out those Arguments that persuade us of the necessity of an infalible Judge, both for our finding out, and for our expounding the Scriptures; they are now sensible of all this, and see that it is a very false Method of arguing to prove the Scriptures by the Church, when the Church must be first proved by the Scriptures; and therefore they do betake themselves to the Infalibility of Oral Tradition, founding it upon this General Topic. That all the men of one Age must needs have instructed the following Age in the same Faith that they had received from the former Age, and upon this a great many imaginary impossibilities are reckoned up to shew, that this could not fail, and so they infer the certainty of this method of conveyance. Now this is so extravagant, ridiculous, and so contrary to the common experience of all mankind, that all that can possibly be said to support it, signifies no more but to shew how many fine things a man of wit can say to prove the impossibility of a thing which yet every man of sense knows is not only possible, but is, so certain an effect of such an Oral Conveyance, that it is rather impossible it should not fail. How was the first Oral Tradition of the Religion delivered to Adam, corrupted? And the long lives of the first Patriarchs is a much stronger Argument for proving the impossibility of such a corruption, than any that these Gentlemen can alledge. How was the Jewish Religion corrupted in our Saviour's time, tho the only Scene of their solemn Worship being at Jerusalem, and the assembling of their whole Nation in their Temple, three times a year, are much stronger Inducements to make us conclude that it was impossible for an Oral Conveyance to miscarry among them, than any that can be pretended to amongst Christians. Do we not see that the most common Transactions are so diversified after they have passed through a few hands, that Truth is very soon lost, when it hath no better Standard, than Fame and Chat? Do not all Languages change so much in a course of some ages, that those who lived here 200 years ago, would be no more understood, if they were now among us, and yet it were easy to point out the Infalibility of the conveyance of a Language with much livelier

livelier colours than these men can lay on here. If Oral Tradition hath any pretension to certainty, is must be chiefly with relation to such things as are sensible and visible, and that fall under the observation of all men; for in matters that are speculative, it is natural for every man to dress them according to those explications with which he cloaths them; and if his Reputation either for Piety, Learning, or a true understanding of matters is established, it is probable, that these will be so well received, that what was believed in one age in some general words, will be believed in another, with the addition of those new explications, that it were indeed a wonder if it were otherwise, especially in Ages of Ignorance and Superstition: If it is found that in things which are sensible, this Oral Tradition is so certainly changed, that we are as sure of it as we can possibly be of any matter of History; then it is a vain thing to go about to persuade us, that this is an infallible conveyance in matters of Doctrine, since it is plain, that the one is much more like to be sure, than the other can ever be supposed to be. If in the Worship of God the Adoration of Images and Saints, and an infinity of new Rites are brought in; if in the Sacrament, the Adoration of it, the denying the Cup to all except the Priest, the *denying the Sacrament* to Infants; if in the Government of the Church the Popes have not only brought the other Bishops to become subject to them, but have broke through the Authority of Metropolitans, and the Equality that was settled between themselves and the other Patriarchs, tho these things were enacted by the first General Councils; if Popes have got possession of an Authority over Princes, when they were either Hereticks, or were favourers of Hereticks, and have maintained this Possession these last 600 years; if, I say, all these things, which are not only sensible, but are very contrary to those Inclinations and Interests, that are the powerful Springs of human nature, have yet been brought into the world so manifestly, is it any wonder, if in dark ages (in which a blind Obedience, and an unreserved Submission to Church-men were looked on as the chief Branches of Catholick Religion) a great many new Doctrines, that were infinitely for the advantage of a corrupt and designing Clergy were introduced and received: Instead of wondering at the success of all the Innovations, we should have had much more reason to wonder if they had not prevailed.

But upon the whole matter, all these new Methods shew us, that those who manage them, see the weakness of the old ones, and that their Cause cannot be maintained on that bottom, on which the Writers of Controversy had at first put it; and that therefore they must a little change their way; and this being an age, in which Wit and fine

Thoughts are highly valu'd, those who fancied they were Masters in those, hoped to raise a sunk Cause; which how successful soever it may be, when it is managed by *Dragons*, yet hath never appeared more naked and despicable, than it hath done of late years. Therefore they have given this new *Air* and Turn to the common Subjects of the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition, and have betaken themselves to the certainty of Oral Tradition, as their last retrenchment; and after all those Declarations that have been made of late, against those who pretended not to carry the assurance of our Religion beyond a moral certainty, they now fly to a Plea, which if it were true, is but at most a moral certainty; but is so far from being true, that we have as much certainty as we can have for a negative Proposition, that it is and ever must be false.

The Author of this Treatise offers us a new Essay of one of these late Methods; for instead of attacking our Reformation in any of its essential Parts, he goes about only to prove that it was not Canonical; and all this, when it were granted to be true, amounts to no more than this, that the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome* having been extremely advantageous to the Clergy, the greater part of them were too much locked up in Ignorance, and too much addicted to their Interests to admit of any change; and that therefore the lesser part was forced to make use of the Civil power to support them in reforming those Abuses. But this must be acknowledged to be lawful; otherwise all National-Reformations from received Errors, are no more to be thought on. For, suppose an Error hath overspread a National Church, which is a Supposition that none can deny, how infallible soever the Catholick Church may be supposed to be, it is past dispute, that every particular Church may be so over-run with Errors, that the greater part may be infected; and if this falls to be in a Conjunction, in which a General Council cannot be called; and if the Heresy is new, such as for instance the *Pelagian* was, when it first appeared; so that it had spread far before it had been condemned by a General Council; what must be done in such a case? If the Prince may not support the Sounder, tho the Lesser Part? So that according to this Supposition, if those Doctrines and Forms of Worship that were reformed in the last Age, were Erroneous or Idolatrous, then any supposed Irregularities that might be in the way of managing it, can never blemish that Work. It is certain, that all Rules are only for quiet times; in the days of Peace and Order, the transgressing of established Rules, is without doubt a very censurable thing; but this must not be applied to all times. For, tho in a settled time we know how much respect we owe to Judges and Ministers of State; yet if these very Persons will go to set on a Rebellion, and authorize it, all that respect ought presently to be thrown off.

CHAP. II.

Some general Considerations upon what is alledged of the uncanonical Proceedings in the Progress of our Reformation.

IT hath a very ill Grace to see a man of the *Roman* Communion talk so highly of the Obligation to obey the Canons of the Church, so as almost to *Outchurch us*, upon some supposed Irregularities in our *Reformation*. For what is the whole Constitution of the *Papacy*, but one continued Contradiction to all the *Ancient Canons*? And what is the whole modern *Canon Law*, but the Exaltation of the Papal Authority, above all the Canons of the Church? Is there any thing clearer in the Primitive times, than the establishing the Authority of Metropolitans, that was confirmed by the Council of *Nice*; the equalling the Bishops of *Constantinople* to the Bishops of *Rome*, which was done by the 2^d and 4th General Council; the establishing the *Independency* of those Churches that were in Possession of it, and so freeing them from all Subordination to other Sees, which was done by the 3^d General Council? And yet, tho here we see the four first General Councils, all concurring to establish this form of Government, the Papal-power is no other than a breaking in upon all these Canons. What is more uncanonical than the establishing *Legatine Causes*, the receiving of *Appeals*, the obliging of Bishops to sue for their *Bulls* in the Court of *Rome*, the dispensing with all the Canons of the Church, the exempting all the Regulars from Obedience to their Bishops, which is not only contrary to the express Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, but is plainly contrary to that Authority that Bishops derive from Christ to govern the Flocks committed to their care. In short, the whole System of the Church and Court of *Rome*, is so direct a revolt from all the Primitive Canons, that is a degree of Confidence, which I do not envy in our Author, for him to talk of uncanonical Proceedings.

Canons are Rules established, either by Provincial Synods, or more General Councils, which import no more but that they ought to be commonly observed; for it is plain, that there is no Church in the World, that hath looked on the Canons of the former times, as things so sacred and unalterable, that they could never be dispensed with. The Schism of the two Popes at *Rome* and *Avignon*, and all that was done in consequence of it, was uncanonical with a Witness; and yet how was all that buried by the Council of *Constance*? And tho one of the two Obediences was certainly in a state of Schism, yet all that was passed over, and without any Submission of either side, all was healed up.

The whole Constitution of Metropolitans with their Provincial Synods, which was the ancientest and clearest of all the Primitive Rules, arises only out of the several Divisions of the Provinces of the *Roman Empire*; when then the Civil Constitution of all *Europe* is so much altered from what it was then; all that Fabrick subsists now rather upon a respect to ancient Rules, than from the Authority of those Canons, which can no more remain, the ground upon which they were built, being now removed. And one may as well pretend that we are bound to obey the old *Roman Law*, or the Feudal Law, because those Laws were once received amongst us; as to tell us, that we are bound to obey all the ancient Canons, especially those that had a visible Relation to the Constitution of the *Roman Empire*. Therefore the Subordination of Churches, of Synods, and Metropolitans, and Patriarchs, that was only the knitting into one Body, and under several degrees of Subordination, a Church that was all under one Civil Society and Empire, hath sunk with the *Roman Empire*. So that the tearing that Empire in pieces, hath quite put an end to all that Ecclesiastical Subordination. And if there is any thing of that yet kept up amongst us, it is rather for the preserving of Order, than that we are under any Obligation of Conscience to submit to such Constitutions. And therefore, as oft as a great Conjunction of Affairs carries along with it considerations that are of more weight, than the adhering to ancient Forms, then all these may be well superseded. For all Rules are temporary things, and made according to several Emergences and Occasions, which altering frequently, it were a very unreasonable thing to expect that every Church should at all times conform itself to them. And tho we condemn that Dissolution of all the Canons which the Church and Court of *Rome* hath brought into the World, yet on the other hand we cannot acknowledge any such binding Authority in them, that they can never be dispensed with.

The Methods of those men with whom we deal, are wonderful. Now they reproach our Church with a Violation of ancient Canons, and yet when we lay to their charge some of the Canons that their Councils have made in these later Ages, such as those of the *Lateran*, for the *Extirpation of Hereticks*, and for the Pope's power of *deposing Heretical Princes*; they tell us, that great difference is to be made between the Decisions of the Church in the Points of Faith, and the Decrees that are made in matter of Discipline; since, tho they assert an Infallibility in the one, yet the other are transient things, in which we ought not to admit of so absolute an Authority. This is false with relation to decrees, that declare a Christians duty, or a Rule of Morality: For Decrees in such matter do import an Article of

of Faith or Doctrine upon which they are founded. And therefore a Church may indeed, even in the Opinion of those who believe her infallible, err in a particular Judgment against such or such a Heretical Prince; for that being founded on a matter of Fact, she may be Infallible still, even tho she were surpris'd in matters of Fact. But she cannot be Infallible, if in declaring the Duty of Subjects towards Heretical Princes, or of the Popes Authority in those cases, she hath set Rules contrary to the Word of God. In such matters as these are, I do acknowledge the Decrees of the Church are for ever Obligatory upon all those who believe her Infallible. Therefore, since our Author urges so much the Authority of the Canons, I would gladly know what he thinks of these, which are not, I confess, *Ancient*, yet they were enacted by the Supreme Authority of that Body which they account Infallible. It is true, some have thought they could get out of this difficulty by denying these to be the Acts of that Council. But if our Author be the same Person with him that writ concerning the Adoration of the Eucharist, he is of another mind, and doth acknowledge, that *those Canons are the true Acts of that great Assembly, and not only the Designs of the Pope*. It is true, he saith, the sense of the Canon concerning the secular Powers, is by Protestants mistaken. But he hath not yet given himself the trouble of laying before us the true sense of that Canon; and one would think that he who writ the Treatise that is now under Examination, had very favourable thoughts of the Doctrine of Subjects shaking off an heretical Prince, for he reckons up the *many risings that were in K. Edwards days, chiefly for matter of Religion*, as a proof that the Body of the Clergy went not into that change. *Which rising* (saith he) *of the Laity in such numbers for their former way of Religion, would not have been, had not their Clergy justified it unto them*. Rising is a soft word for *Rebellion*, and one would think, that it would have afforded no small matter of reproach against us, if we brought in a company of Rebels to make up a Muster of our Religion. But to own that *the Clergy justified it to them*, without adding the least Word expressing our Author's dislike of this, shews plainly enough, that how good a Subject soever our Author may be to a Prince of his own Religion, yet he thinks a Catholick Clergy may be able to justify to the Laity, a Rising against a Heretical Prince upon the account of Religion. And it seems our Author had a great mind to make a huge appearance of his Catholick Rebels in K. Edwards days. For, besides that he speaks of Risings in many more Counties then are mentioned by the Books of that times, he also represents all those Risings to have been upon the account of Religion; tho the History makes it clear that the Risings over England, were chiefly occasioned

Adorat. of the
Euchar. p. 28.

P. 139.

by

by Parks and Enclosures; and that it was a rage of the Peasants against the Gentry in most places; chiefly in the *North*. The Rebellion, where Religion was not at all pretended; nor doth it appear that any pretended Religion, except those of *Devonshire*; so that our Author would make his Party and the Clergy more Rebels than indeed they were. In this whole period he seems to have been forsaken of common sense.

C H A P. III.

Some general Considerations on the Royal Supremacy, that was raised so high at the Reformation.

OUR Author hath brought together many Acts of Parliament with their pompous Preambles, that seem to carry the Kings Power in Ecclesiastical Matters to a very indefinite degree, and upon all this he triumphs often, as if this was so improper, that it alone is enough to blast the whole Reformation.

Our Author is much more concerned to justify all Papal Bulls, than we can be to justify all the Words of our Laws; especially, the Rhetorick that is in their Preambles. If he believes the Pope infallible, the general Parts of Bulls that set forth the Doctrine of the Church, are such solemn Declarations, that he must be determined by them. But at lowest he believes the Pope to be the Center of the Catholick Unity, and all Bishops are bound by Oath to obey all their Decrees and Ordinances. Now when our Author will undertake to justify all the Preambles of Bulls that are in the *Bullarium*, then we may undertake to justify all the flourish that may be in any Act of Parliament.

When any Authority is asserted in general and indefinite Terms, these are always to be understood with those Restrictions and Limitations that the nature of things require, to be supposed even when they are not expressed. *St. Paul* expresses the obedience of Wives to their Husbands in terms so extremely extended, that as the Church is subject unto Christ, so ought the Wives to be to their own Husbands in every thing. He expresses also the Duty of Children in as comprehensive terms. *Children obey your Parents in all things*. Now if one would draw Inferences from the extent of these words, he might, taking the liberty that our Author takes upon some of the Expressions that are in our Acts of Parliament, represent the Authority that *St. Paul* vests both in Husbands and Parents, as a very boundless, and a very

EX.

extravagant thing. This is enough to shew that in all those large Phrases of Obedience, there are some necessary Reserves and Exceptions to be understood; and if this Qualification is necessary, even in writings that were inspired, it is no wonder if some of the Rhetorick of our Acts of Parliament wants a little of this Correction.

It is a very unreasonable thing to urge some general Expressions, or some stretches of the Royal Supremacy, and not to consider that more strict Explanation that was made of it, both in K. Henry the 8th's time, and under Q. Elizabeth; That were so clear, that if we had to do with Men that had not resolved before-hand not to be satisfied, one would think there could be no room for any further cavilling. In K. Henry's time, the extent of the Kings Supremacy was defined in the necessary *Explanation of a Christian man*, that was set forth as the Standard of the Doctrine of that time; and it was upon this that all people were obliged to take their measures, and not upon some Expressions either in Acts of Parliament, or Acts of the Convocation, nor upon some stretches of the Kings Jurisdiction. In this then it is plainly said, That with relation to the Clergy, the King is to oversee them, and to cause that they execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, and especially in those Points, which by Christ and his Apostles was committed to them; And to this it is added, That Bishops and Priests are bound to obey all the Kings Laws, not being contrary to the Laws of God. So that here is expressed that necessary Reserve upon their Obedience, it being provided, that they were only bound to obey, when the Laws were not contrary to the Laws of God. The other Reserve is also made of all that Authority which was committed by Christ and his Apostles, to the Bishops and Priests; and we are not allow'd to own it freely, that we see no other Reserves upon our obedience to the King besides these: So that these being here specified, there was an unexceptionable Declaration made of the Extent of the Kings Supremacy; yet because the term, *Head of the Church*, had something in it that seem'd harsh, there was yet a more express Declaration made of this matter, under Q. Elizabeth, of which indeed our Author hath taken notice; tho I do not find he takes notice of the former, which he ought to have, if he had intended to have represented this matter sincerely to the world, (which I confess seems not to have troubled him much.) The Explanation made by Q. Eliz. is so express, that even our Author cannot find any advantage against the Words themselves, but acknowledges that they are such general Terms, that the Article itself may be subscribed Page 87, 88. by all sides. Since then the declared Sense of those general and extended expressions that are in some Acts of Parliament, is such, that there

there lies no just Exception against it; and since this Sense was not only given by Q. *Eliz.* who allowed such as took the Oath to declare that they took it in that sense; but it was afterwards enacted both in Convocation and in Parliament, and put into the Body of our Confession of Faith, This Explanation must be considered as the true measure of the Kings Supremacy; and the wide expressions in the former Laws must be understood to be restrained by this; since posterior Laws derogate from those that were at first made. So that according to all this, the Kings Supremacy doth not give to our Princes the ministering either of Gods Word, or of the Sacraments. — But that only Prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, That they should rule all Estates and Degrees committed to their Charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the Civil Sword the stubborn and the evil-doers. This is all that Supremacy which we are bound in conscience to own, and if the Letter of the Law, or the stretches of that in the Administration of it, have carried this further, we are not at all concerned in it: But in case any such thing were made out, it could amount to no more than this, That the Civil Power had made some Encroachments on Ecclesiastical Authority; but the submitting to an Oppression, and the bearing it till some better times may deliver us from it, is no Argument against our Church; on the contrary, it is a proof of our Temper and Patience, and of that Respect we pay to that Civil Authority which God hath set over us, even when we think that it passeth its bounds. But all that we are bound to acknowledge in the Kings Supremacy, is so well limited, that our Author hath nothing to object to it.

Our men of the *Mission* have always made a great noise of the Kings Supremacy, as if it were the most absurd thing that can be imagined; without considering, that as the Supremacy is explained by the Article of our Church it is practised by almost all the States and Princes of *Europe*: It hath been clearly made out by many of our Writers, that the Kings of *England* before the Reformation, were in possession of this Supremacy, and that they really exercised it, even before they pretended so formally to it. I will not enter into this Enquiry, which is so well laid open by Sir *Roger Twissden*, that a man must have a great stock of Confidence to deny it, after he hath read him. In *France* all Ecclesiastical Causes are carried before the Courts of Parliament by Appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts, and are finally judged there: Now the Supremacy is always where the last Appeal lies, and we may see both in *Godeau*, and many other modern Writers, how much they complain of this as a servitude under which their Church is brought, and as an infraction of all the Ancient

Ancient Canons. The Court of Parliament at *Paris* examines all the Bulls that come from *Rome*, and condemns and tears them as oft as they see cause: So that tho all the Bishops of *France* are bound by Oath to obey all the Popes Decrees and Ordinances, yet this can take no effect till the Parliament hath confirmed them. How easie were it to carry this matter far, and to shew, that by this, the Popes Power, either as he is *St. Peter's* Successor, and thereby vested with an Universal Authority over the Flock of Christ, or as he is the Patriarch of the *West*, and the Center of the Catholick Unity, is subjected to the Judgment of a Secular Court, who will not suffer the Sheep to hear his voice, till they have first examined it. And what is the whole *Concordat*, but a bargain made between the Popes, and the Crown of *France*, to divide the spoils of that Church and its Liberties between them; for whereas the *Pragmatick Sanction* had established the Clergy in the possession of its Ancient Rites, *Lewis* the 11th, and after him *Francis* the 1st, saw well how much this lessened that unbounded degree, to which they intended to carry their Authority, and therefore they consented to give the Popes their share, so they would warrant their enslaving that Church. It is known what Complaints, and what opposition the *French* Clergy have made upon this matter; yet at last they bear it, and submit to it; so that here the last Appeal, the Check upon the Papal Authority, and the nomination of all the Bishops and Abbots of *France*, are wholly in the Civil Courts, and in the King. If it is said, that in some particulars the Supremacy of our Kings goes further; tho that were acknowledged to be true, yet since the *more* or the *less* does not alter the nature of things, it must be confessed, that according to our Author's Principles, the whole *Gallian* Church is in an Uncanonical State as well as we are: But tho they do not stick to confess, that they are in a state of oppression by reason of the *Concordat*, and of the unbounded Authority of their Parliaments, yet they do not think that this makes them irregular or uncanonical as to the Constitution of their Church.

I might upon this likewise shew, how not only the Repoblick of *Venice*, but even the Crown of *Spain*, notwithstanding all its Bigotry, exercises still so great a Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Matters, that there is only some difference of degrees between that which belongs to the Crown of *England* by Law, and that which is practised elsewhere. The Court of the Monarchy in *Cisly* is well known, in which, by virtue of a forged Bull (which is made out to be a Forgery beyond all contradiction) that declares the Kings of *Cisly* the Popes Vicars; there is a Lay-man that is the Kings Vicar-General, who is the Judge of that Court, and to whom all Spiritual Causes are brought, and who judges them all, as a spiritual Person, and that hath the Titles and outward Respect that is given to the Pope, likewise paid to him. This is the carrying an Imposture very far; yet, since it is done in the Vertue of a pretended Bull, which the Crown of *Spain* will still maintain to be a true one; none hath ever

opposed this to such a degree, as to pretend that the whole Clergy of *Sicily* are become irregular, because they submit to this Court, and appear before it. So that upon the whole matter, if the great and unmeasured Extent of the Papal Authority, made our Princes judge it necessary to secure themselves from those Invasions, by stretching their Jurisdiction a little too much; on the other hand, those who have submitted so tamely to the one, have no reason to reproach us for bearing the other Servitude; even, supposing that we granted that to be the Case. And if in the time of our Reformation, some of our Bishops, or other Writers have carried the Royal Supremacy too far, either in Acts of Convocation, or in their Writings, as those things are personal Matters, in which we are not at all concerned, who do not pretend to assert an Infallibility in our Church; so their excess in this, was a thing so natural, that we have all possible reason to excuse it, or at least to censure it very gently. For as all Parties and Persons are carried by a Bias very common to Mankind, to magnifie that Authority which favours and supports them; so the extremes of the Papal Tyranny, and the Ecclesiastical Power that had formerly prevailed, might have carried them a little too far into the opposite Extrem, of raising the Civil Power too high.

But after all we find, that when *Theodosius* came to the Empire, he saw the *Eastern* half of it over-run with *Arrianism*; and as the *Arrians* were in Possession, and were the more numerous; so they had Synods of Bishops that had met oft, and in vast numbers, and had judged in their favours. Their Synods were both more numerous than that of *Nice*, and were a more just Representative of the Catholick Church, since there were very few of the *Western* Bishops in that which was held at *Nice*. And as for the Frauds and Violences that were put in practice to carry Matters in those Synods, it is very like the *Arrians* both denied them, and were not wanting to recriminate on the Orthodox. So when there was a pretence of General Councils in both hands, here was a very perplexed Case. But *Theodosius* found a short way to get out of it; and therefore, instead of calling a new General Council, or of examining the History of the several pretended Councils, which ought to have been done according to our Authors System; he pass'd a Law, which is the first Law in *Justinians Code*, by which he required all Persons to profess that Faith which was professed by *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, and *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*; and yet this Law which was a higher Invasion on the Ecclesiastical Authority, than any that was committed in our Reformation, was never so much as censured; on the contrary, *Theodosius* was highly magnified for it. There is no reason to imagine, that he paid any particular Respect to the See of *Rome* in this; for his joining *Peter* of *Alexandria* with *Damasus*, shews that he made the Faith of these Bishops the measures of that Doctrine which he resolved to protect, not because of the Authority of their See; but because he believed their Faith was Orthodox. The Case was almost the same

in England, in which it was pretended that the Independent Authority of our Metropolitans ought to be asserted, which was established by the Council of Nice; and that many Corruptions in the Worship, as for instance, the Worship of Images that was condemned by two very numerous General Councils, one is the *East at Constantinople*; and another in the *West at Frankfurt*, ought to be reformed. If upon all this the Supreme Civil Authority of this Nation, had enacted such a Law as *Theodosius* had done, commanding all to follow the Doctrine professed by the two Arch Bishops of this Church, it had been no other, but a copying after that Pattern, which *Theodosius* had set us with the Approbation of all Antiquity; and yet it cannot be pretended, that our Kings and Parliament acted in so summary a way; For they went much more slowly and maturely to Work.

Upon the whole matter, the Civil Authority hath a Power to command every thing that is just and lawful; and in that Case, the Laws that flow from it ought to be obeyed. And if the matter of the Laws is sinful, we must not indeed obey in that case, but we must submit and bear what we do not like, and suffer where we cannot obey. So that lawful or unlawful seem to be the only measures that ought to govern our Obedience. And as in the matters of natural Religion and Morality, no Body can deny that the Civil Authority hath a full Scope, tho' that is still limited by this, that there ought to be no Injustice, Immorality, or Turpitude in the Actions that are commanded; but where this is not, we are bound to obey all the Laws that relate to those matters; and where it is, we are bound to submit and to bear our burden, without giving our selves the trouble to enquire, how far the Civil Authority ought to be carried in such matters. We set the same measures to our Obedience in matters of revealed Religion. If the King passes Laws contrary to Scripture, we cannot indeed obey them, because of that higher Authority to which we are subject, and in Obedience to which we pay all Subjection to those whom God hath set over us; but if they are lawful, and conform to the Scripture, we ought to obey them without examining, whether the King hath proceeded in the passing such Laws by the Rules that become quiet and regular Times. And if a *Presbiterian* or *Episcopalian* should rise up, and finding the greatest part of his Subjects, the Priests as well as the People, engaged in Idolatry; if he should reform them, and suppress that corrupt way of Worship, without instead of examining critically the method or steps by which he had brought about that change, rather to rejoice in the goodness of God for blessing us with such a Prince. So that let men write and dispute as long as they will on these matters, the whole Cause must be brought to this short Issue. Either the things that our Princes and Legislators enacted in the Reformation were in themselves just and good, and necessary, or not; if they were, then they having an Authority over us in all lawful things, as they did well to enact these Laws, so we do well to obey them.

But

But if they were neither just nor good, nor necessary, then we acknowledge that as it was a Sin in them to enact them, so it were a Sin in us to obey them: And all other reasonings upon this Subject are but illusions, by which weak minds may perhaps be wrought upon; but they will appear to be such evident Fallacies to men of Sense, that without entering into a strict enquiry of what may be alledged for them, they will easily shake them off.

In short, if the Reformation appears to be a good thing in it self, then all arguing against the manner of it, is but meer trifling; and looks like men, who lie in wait to deceive, and to mislead People by false Colours of Truth.

CHAP. IV.

Reflection on the eighth Thesis, laid down by our Author.

UPON the Grounds that have hitherto been opened, it will not be hard to make a very clear Judgment of all these positions which are laid down as the Foundation of this Work.

The first is, That, the two principal Offices, which the Clergy have received from Christ, are, (1.) To determine Controversies in pure matters of Religion, and to judge what is Truth, and what are Errors, in Faith and Worship. (2.) To teach and promulgate this Truth, and to excommunicate Church-members on those who receive it not.

All this is true; but since our Author doth not prove that the Clergy are infallible in their Decisions, which is not so much as pretended by any, with relation to National Churches, this only proves, that it is the duty of the Clergy to declare and publish the truth; but as the Body of a National Clergy may err, so in case it should actually err, can it be supposed that the People and the Prince are bound to err with it? Synods are of great use for the Unity of the Church, and a vast respect is due to their Decisions; but since our Author names the Synods of the *Arians*, the many Synods that they had, which were very numerous, and were gathered from all parts, gave them all the advantages from this Authority that could be desired; so that if the Council of *Nice* had not had truth of its side, I do not see why the Visible Authority should not rather be thought to lye on the *Arian* side. The Prince Authorizing a Synod, or his Opposing it, is to be justified or condemned from the Decisions that are made by it; if they are good, he ought to support them; and if they are bad, he ought to oppose them; and in this he must judge for himself, as every other man must do, the best he can; as knowing that he must be judged by God.

The Second is, That the Clergy cannot make over this Authority to the Secular Government,

Governour, being charged by Christ to execute it to the end of the World. Upon which he arraigns Two things; (1.) The Clergies binding themselves never to make any Decisions in matters of Faith or Worship, till they had first obtained the consent of the Secular Governour. (2.) The Clergies Authorizing the Secular Governour, or those whom he should nominate to determine those matters in their stead.

It is certain, no Clergy in the World can make any such Deputation; and if any have done it, it was a personal Act of theirs, which was null of it self, and did not indeed bind those who made it, it being of its own nature unlawful, but much less can it bind their Successors; but if the Church of England never did neither the one nor the other, what a Prevaricator and False Accuser is he, who as he *lied* long to God and Man, when he pretended to be of this Church, so resolves now to lye concerning this Church as much as ever he did to it? The submission of the Clergy related only to New Canons and Constitutions, as the other Act empowering a select number to be nominated by the King to form a Body of a Canon-Law, related only to the matters of the Government of the Church; the Religion and Worship had no relation to it; so a compromise as to matters of Government is very unjustly stretched, when this is made a surrender of the Authority of determining and declaring matters relating to Doctrine and Worship, which no Church-man without breach of the most sacred of all Trusts can deliver up; but in the matters of Ecclesiastical Policy, all States in the World have felt enough from the Yoke of the Papacy to give them just reason to assure themselves against any more of such Ecclesiastical Tyranny; besides, that in all the engagements tho made in Terms that are general, such as are all Oaths of Obedience; and in particular, those that are made by Prelates to the Popes, exceptions are still understood, even when they are not expressed: As long then as the Church enjoys a protection from the Civil Authority, she is bound to make returns of all engagements, not only of Submission, but of Obedience: But tho the one is perpetual, the other has its limits; and when the Church finds its oppressions from the Civil Power really to overbalance the Protection that she receives from it, in that case she must resolve to fall into a state of Persecution; and all the engagements that any body of the Clergy have made, relating only to the maintaining a peaceable Correspondence with the Civil Powers, they do not at all bind up Church-men from doing their Duty, in case the Civil Authority sets it self to overthrow Religion: Besides, when both Religion, and the Worship, and the Constitution of a Church is once established, the adding new Canons may perhaps be of great use to a Church; but yet it cannot be supposed to be so indispensably necessary, but that rather than give any distaste to the Sovereign, they may content themselves with what they have without asking new Canons; and a Church under a Body of Ca-

nons may likewise resign up the compiling of these into a new System, and the leaving out such as are found inconsistent with the Publick Peace, to such persons as shall be nominated by the Prince; but all this, how general soever the words may be, hath still a tacit exception in it, which all that know the Principles of Law will grant.

The Third Thesis is, *That the Prince cannot depose any of his Clergy, without the consent of the major part of the Clergy, or their Ecclesiastical Superior, and in particular of the Patriarch.*

In this the matter must still be reduced to the former Point: Either the Grounds of such a Deposition are in themselves just, or not; if they are just, the Prince may as lawfully hinder any Church-man from corrupting his Subjects, while he is supported by a Publick Authority, or a settled Revenue, as he may hinder a man that hath the Plague on him, from going about to infect his People; for his deposing such a one is only the taking the Civil Encouragement from him: but when this is done unjustly, it is without doubt an act of high Oppression in the Prince; and as for the Person Deposed, and those over whom he was set, they are to consider according to the Rules of Prudence, whether the present Cases of such importance, that it will balance the inconveniences of their throwing themselves into a state of Persecution; for it is to be confessed, that Church-men have by their Office an indefinite Authority of feeding the Flock, which cannot be dissolved by any act of the Prince; but the appropriating this to such a Precinct, and the supporting it by Civil Encouragements, it is a humane thing, and is therefore subject to the Sovereign Power. The Princes of Judah notwithstanding an express Law of God which appropriated the Priesthood, and the High priesthood, to such a Family and Race of men, did turn them off out, and *Jehoshaphat* sent to his Princes to teach in the cities of Judah, and with them he sent about *thirty Priests and Levites*, who went about and taught the people: He did also set up in Jerusalem a Court made up of *Levites, Priests, and the chief of the Fathers of Israel*, for the judgment of the Lord, and for the controversies among the people; and appointed *Amariah* the Chief-priest, to be over them in the matters of the Lord. *Amariah* when he came to Reign, commanded the *Priests* and the *Levites* to sanctify themselves in order to the reforming the Worship, in which he went on, tho a great many of the *Priests* could not be ready to keep the *Passover* in the first Month, he with his Princes, and the whole Congregation, put off the Feast from the 1st to the 14 Month. Now the distraction of days, and the observance of those Festivities, being so great a part of that Religion, and it having been so expressly regulated by the Law of God, that it should be kept on the first Month, a Provision being

made only for such as were *unleaven*, or such as were on a *Journey*, that they might keep it on the 2d. Month; yet here the Civil Authority makes a Law, appointing the *Passover* to be entirely cast over to the 2d. Month, because of the Uncleanness of some of the *Priests*. Ezra took a Commission from the *Rulers*, empowering him to set up *Magistrates and Judges*, who might judge them that knew the *Laws of his God*, and teach them who knew them not; and one of the Punishments on the Disobedient, is *separation from the Congregation*; to which our Excommunication answers. And we see what a Reformation Ezra made in the virtue of this Commission. Nehemiah by virtue of such another Commission, turned out a Priest for having married a *strange Woman*. These were all as high stretches of the Civil Power, as any can be objected to our Reformation. But in the next place, it ought to be considered, that, suppose this turning out of the Clergy had been an illegal and unjustifiable thing, yet that doth not strike at the Constitution of our Church. The High-Priesthood among the *Jews* by the Law of God, was settled on the eldest Branch of the Family of *Aaron*, and it went so during the first Temple, and likewise for some considerable time under the second Temple; and yet, tho afterwards this sacred Function came to be set to Sale, so that Dr. Lightfoot hath reckoned up fifty three that purchased it for Money, by which prophane Merchandize one might infer, that those Mercenary High-Priests were no more to be acknowledged; yet our Saviour, and after him St. Paul, owned them to be High-Priests. Our Saviour answered to *Caiaphas*, when he adjured him upon Oath; and it is said by St. John, that *Caiaphas*, as High-Priest for that year, Prophesied. From all which it is clear, that tho these wretched men were guilty of the highest Prophanation and Sacrilege possible, yet that was a personal Sin in them; but since they were in Possession of the Dignity, and adhered still to the Law of *Moses*, and performed the Offices of their Function according to his Institution, the solemn yearly Expiation was still made by them, which was the highest Act of the whole Jewish Worship; and they were to be submitted to, and acknowledged as High-Priests by the People, for which our Saviour's practice is an undisputable warrant. Now, if all this was lawful under the *Old Testament*, in which all the smallest parts of that Religion were marked and enacted, much more expressly than they are under the *New*, then it will be a hard performance for any to persuade us, that the Civil Authority may not make such Reformations in the Christian Church, as the Kings of *Judah* did in the Jewish. In this matter, I have not so much as mentioned the Orders and Regulations made by *David* and *Solomon*, tho they are very clear Precedents for justifying all that Supremacy to which our Kings have pretended. But, since I know some have endeavoured to set all this aside, by saying, that they being assisted by immediate Inspirations acted in those matters not as Kings, but as Prophets. Tho it were easy to shew the falshood of this Allegation; yet, since I would

Numb. 9.
10.

EZRA. 7.
25.

Nehem.
13. 28.

shorten

shorten matters as I can, I will not digress into a controverted point. Under the pretension that the Christian Church received from the Emperors that became Christians, we see that they appointed *Triers* to examine the Matters that were objected to *Bishops*; and these under *Constantine* judged in *Cicilian's* Matter upon an Appeal made by the *Donatists*, after it had been already judged in several Synods. *Constantine* did likewise by his own Authority put *Eusebius* out of *Antioch*, *Athanasius* out of *Alexandria*, and *Paul* out of *Constantinople*. It is true, these Matters were much complained of, as unjust, and as flowing from the false Suggestions of the *Arians*: But it is as true, that it was not so much as pretended, that the Emperor had so just Authority to do it. For the disputing the Justice of the Exercise of an Authority, is very different from their disputing the Authority it self. It was afterwards a common Practice of the Christian Emperors to have a Court of some selected *Bishops*, who waited on them, and to whose Cognizance most Causes relating to *Bishops* were left, who acted only by Commission from the Emperor: I have enlarged a little upon this Point, because it seemed necessary to dissipate many of those Prejudices, which arise out of it.

The 4th. Thesis is, *That a Provincial or National Synod cannot lawfully make Definitions in Matters of Faith, and concerning Heresies or Abuses in Gods Service, contrary to the Decrees of former superior Synods, or to the Judgment of the Universal Church in the present Age, shewed in her publick Liturgies.*

This is founded on the Supposition of the Infallibility of the Church; so if that is not true, then this falls to the ground, and that is not pretended to be proved by our Author, who seems only to proceed upon the Subordination that is in the Ecclesiastical Body. But if the majority of this Body is not Infallible, then that Obligation to submit to it, must be only a matter of Order; and by consequence, it hath its limits. If this had been the Rule of the Church in *Theodosius's* time, how could the several Provinces have reformed themselves from *Arianism*, after so many General Councils had declared for it, or at least had rejected the word *Consubstantial*? but in our condemning the Papal Authority over us, we had both the Council of *Nice* for us, that had established the Independent Authority of the Metropolitans, with the *Bishops* of their Province, for all Matters relating to their Province; and the Decree of the Council of *Ephesus*, which appointed all Churches to continue in the Possession of that Independence upon any other superior Sees, which was past Prescription. We had likewise superior Councils justifying us in many of the Branches of our Reformation.

If we must seek the Sense of the Universal Church in her publick Liturgies, then we have the Liturgies of the *Greek Church* for us in many other Points; and the Corruptions of the Liturgies of the *Roman Church* were so gross, that they themselves have been ashamed of a great many of them, and have thrown them out, tho' a great many more remain still to be reformed: And if the

publick

publick Liturgies are to be considered as the Standards of the Sense of the present Church, as no doubt they are, then all those *Expositions* and *Responsories* that are now obtruded on us, are to be thrown out of Doors, and we must seek the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in her publick Liturgies.

The 5th Thesis. *That a Synod consisting partly of a National Clergy, unjustly deposed or restrained, and consisting partly of Persons unjustly introduced, and partly of Persons who have been first threatened with Fines, Imprisonments and Deprivation, in case of their Non-conformity to the Prince's Injunctions in matters merely Spiritual; is hence to be accounted a lawful National Synod, and the Acts thereof free and valid.*

All this falls to the ground, if the Reasons upon which such Persons were turned out, were just. And in that case, such Vacancies may be justly filled. But it is an impudent thing to found much on this, when the number of those who were turned out, was so very inconsiderable, as it was in K. Henry's, and K. Edward's time; and if such a small terror as the loss of a Benefice is thought by our Author so dreadful a thing, as it may be well judged by the operation it had upon himself for 25 years, so that this derogates from the freedom of an Assembly; then there never was any free, even that at Nice not excepted. For it is the same fear whether one is threatened with it before such a decision is made, or if they knew that it must follow upon it: Now this formidable business of losing a Benefice, and a banishment upon the back of it, was really the case of the Council of Nice, since this was the condition of those who refused to subscribe their Definition: So the Principle laid down by our Author, taken from fear, must either be false, or this will annul all the Ecclesiastical Meetings that ever were.

The Sixth Thesis is, *That the Judgment of the smaller part of the Clergy, even tho' the Archbishop were of that number, cannot be called the Judgment of the Clergy of that Province; and a Prince that follows the Directions of a few of his Clergy, cannot be said to be guided by his Clergy, but to go against it.*

This is very true; but yet Theodosius thought fit to give his Sanction to the Faith of two Bishops, upon which all the Arian Party might have as justly said that he acted against his Clergy, for they were then by far the more numerous. The Civil Power is bound to follow those whom they think are in the right, and tho' in common matters, and in settled times, it is fit to leave things to the majority, yet if it is visible, that the greater number is both ignorant and corrupt, and that the matters under dispute are chiefly such things that are of great advantage to the Clergy, both for entreating their Wealth, and for advancing their credit, then the Secular Power hath just reason to be jealous of the greater number of the Clergy, since Interest gives a mighty bias, and their following the lesser number in such a case is very justifiable; for humanely speaking, it were impossible to find the greater number willing to go into such a change.

The Seventh Thesis is, *That tho' the Secular Princes had a decisive Power*

in such matters of Faith as are so much formally determined, yet in such Points as have been formerly determined, no Secular Prince can define any such things contrary to those Councils, or contrary to a National Synod.

It is not so much as pretended, that a Secular Prince hath any Power to decide in matters of Faith, whether they are already determined or no; but as for the giving the Sanctions of a Law, and all secular encouragements, a Prince must have a Judgment of Discretion, by which he ought to determine himself; for when he hath given his Sanction, he hath made no sort of Decision in the matter, which is neither more nor less to be believed than it was before; but it is now become legal; and all Princes must proceed in this matter according to the conviction of their Conscience: It is not long since some of this Gentleman's Friends thought to have carried the King of the Abbeys to change the Doctrines and Rites of this Church upon the private suggestion of a few Missionaries, against the whole Body of his Clergy, upon which that Kingdom became a Scene of Rebellion and Bloodshed, till the King himself grew to conceive a horror against those who had push'd him on so violently to overthrow the Laws and Establish'd Customs of that Church: So that a Reformation effected by the King's Authority, tho' managed with ever so much fury and violence, is yet driven on by these men, when it is on their side, and for their advantage.

The Eighth Thesis is, That neither National Synod nor Secular Power can make any new Canon concerning the Government of the Church, contrary to the Ecclesiastical Constitutions of former superior Councils, nor reverse those formerly made by them.

This is such a crude Assertion, that one would think that he who made it, knew neither the History of Councils, nor the nature of Canons and Constitutions, which are all variable, and are made upon such particular occasions as required them to be put in practice; and another Scene of affairs may make it as necessary to reverse them, as ever it was to establish them: The main subject of the Ancient Canons are, Penitentiary Rules relating to the Censure of Offenders, the Subordination of Churches founded on the division of the Roman Empire, and the Duty and Behaviour of Church-men: Of these, the first is quite laid aside in the Church of Rome, and by their means we were so accustomed to be without that Yoke, that we have not been able to bring the World to it. But we have never repealed these, only we let them sleep too long. The Second, relating to the Constitution and the Subordination of Churches, is quite sunk with the fall of the Empire; for if a Town that was the Center of a Province, to which it was easy to have recourse by Letters, and to which the Road and Carriages were regularly laid, and where the Civil Government was also exercised, should after many ages either be separated from the rest of the Province, falling under another Master, or should become a poor and neglected Town, it is a needless adhering to Ancient Custom, to assert still the Privileges of such a See, when all those Reasons which at first procured to it those Privileges, come to cease: As for the Third, which are more perpetual, we pay them all respect, and have never changed them; but the Dispositions of the Church of Rome hath so destroyed them all, that it is a peculiar degree of Confidence for any that are in Communion with that Church, to assert such an immutability in the Ancient Canons, that a National Synod may not be suffered to alter any of them; and yet that one single Bishop, whom all Antiquity considered but as a Collegue and Fellow-Bishop to all the rest of the Order, should be allowed an Authority to break and dissolve them all.

This may serve to shew how weak all those foundations are upon which our Author builds. I come in the next place to examine his Defective and False account of the Matters of Fact, which will engage me into a tedious opening of many Particulars that will be little for our Author's honour; but no Discoveries will affect a Man that could stuff his Conscience for a Year, and that now hath the Impudence to own it.

REFLECTIONS
ON THE
Oxford Theses,

Relating to the
ENGLISH REFORMATION.

PART II.

AMSTERDAM

Printed for P. Bleau. 1688.

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Oxford Theles

Relating to the

ENGLISH REFORMATION

PART II.

AMSTERDAM

Printed for P. Blom 1688.

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Oxford Theses,

Relating to the

ENGLISH REFORMATION.

IN the former part of these *Reflections*, the general grounds on which our Reformation was attacked, were examined; the matters of Fact come now to be considered: but before I enter upon these alledged by our *Author*, I thought it fitting to begin with an Enquiry into a very important matter, relating to that time, that hath been lately objected to our Church, by one of the Church of *Rome*, which as it is New, so it is likewise of great Consequence.

A Sheet has appeared that was well and decently writ, and with a very specious appearance of Reason, to prove that *Q. Elizabeth* was a *Barbary*, not upon the common pretence of the Nullity of *R. Henry* the Eighth's Marriage with her Mother, because his former Marriage with *Q. Katherin*, was still in force: but upon a Precontract, in which *Ann Bullen* was engaged before her Marriage to *R. Henry*, which being confessed by her self, the Marriage was null of it self, and was judged to be so by Arch-Bishop *Cramer*, whose Sentence was confirmed by the Subsequent Parliament. So that here is a Nullity, and by consequence a *Barbary*. It is true, this Assertion is new; so, tho it may raise the Credit of him that hath discovered it, since it must be confessed, that it looks very like good reasoning; yet on the other hand, it is some prejudice against it, that it doth not appear it was ever objected to us before now; and no mention being made of it while the whole matter was fresh in Mens memories, and while that Queen reigned, whose Title this seems to weaken, much more than all the other things that were alledged to make it, is a great Presumption, that the Men of that time

know there was no force in it. So that, tho'the Novelty of it may please, yet it is really a strong prejudice against it. But after all, it must be confessed, the thing is specious, and it is of great consequence, not only with Relation to the Credit of our Church, and of its first Reformation, but with Relation to our present Establishment. For tho'the Writer of that *Sheer* makes no other use of it, but to blemish our Church, as guilty of Sedition and Disloyalty, for owning a Bastard against the Queen of Scots, who was the next lawful Heir; yet it will bear another Consequence that is more important in our present Circumstances. For as a Precontract infers a Nullity of the Marriage, and disables all the Issue of It; so an ill Title in a Queen infers a Nullity upon all her Laws; all her Acts of Government, as flowing from an Usurper; and therefore this strikes not only at the Honour of our Church in the last Age, but at its Settlement in the present; and I believe this last is chiefly intended. For, as to the former, it may serve in a great measure to justify our Church, that Q. Elizabeth was put in Possession of the Crown by the Nation, while it was yet Popish, and by the Body of the Clergy that were of that Religion; so that all that those of our Church did, was to maintain her in that Possession, in which we found her, and in which our Enemies had put Her. And it may be acknowledged, that an anxious weighing of Titles, is not so necessary, after one is in a legal and peaceable Possession, acknowledged by all Parties within the Kingdom, as well as by all Powers without it.

I do not pretend to say, that a Possession will justify a bad Title; tho'there is an *Old* Law relating to the Possession of the Crown of England, called by King Henry the VII. but an undoubted Possession is certainly very much excus'd those who acknowledge and submit to one that is *more* bad. Which was plainly Q. Elizabeth's Case. But however it may be with great colour of Reason alleged, that Right is Right still, and that Possession or Prescription are only pretences of Law; which may have perhaps weight before a Judge; yet there are not sufficient to extinguish a just Title, when matters are considered in themselves, and abstracted from those pleadings that may perhaps be legal, yet so grossly null, as they are Cases national. So I will examine this matter as much as I can, and I will confess, it is raised by that Gentleman, and will not dispute the matter of Fact, as Dr. *Barrow* hath put it, who is the only Author that is cited, and therefore he must be supposed to have some Credit here.

Queen *Ann Boleyn* was arraigned of Treason upon some pretended proofs of Adultery, and so Judgment was given, That she should be *strangled at the Wheel* (which is the Death that the Law prescribes for the Traitors of

of that Sex) or *Believed*. Two days after the Sentence, she is prevailed on to confess a Precontract before Arch-Bishop *Cramer*, and so her Marriage with the King is declared void and null, and in consequence of that the Issue is illegitimated; yet this was so secretly carried, that one of the Judges of that time writes of it as a thing that was only reported, and in the subsequent Act of Parliament, no mention is made of a Precontract, tho' no doubt she had confessed it with the circumstances of Time and Person. Yet in the Act of Parliament, it is only said, that she had confessed some just and lawful Impediments, by which it was evident, that her Marriage with the King was not valid: It cannot be now known, how this matter was expressed in the Sentence given by *Cramer*, all these Records being burnt. But it is most probable, that the matter was more distinctly specified. Now the only Reason we can give of those general Words in the Act of Parliament, is, that this pretended precontract, being with the Earl of *Northumberland*, he had by a solemn Oath, and by his receiving the Sacrament upon it, in the presence of the Duke of *Northumberland*, and some others of the Privy Council, denied any such precontract. Of which *Dr. Burnet* assures us he saw the Original Attestation under that Earl's own hand. This had so far invalidated the Queen's Confession, that it seems the Parliament would not descend into the specifying of her Confession: *Dr. Burnet* hath also given several evidences, of her being at that time so much disordered by Vapours, that this doth in a great measure weaken the Credit of her Testimony even against her self.

Upon this whole matter then, there are three important Considerations, which arise out of the Fact, and any one of these seems strong enough to overthrow all the Inferences that can be drawn from that part of our Story.

1. She was a Person condemned; now all the Examinations of persons condemned, are by the Laws of all Nations, only presumptions, but not proofs; the Terrors of Death, and the Hardships of a Prison, are such just abatements, that Confessions so made, can never have that Credit given them, as to found any Sentence upon them; but in that Queen's Case there are two things which give this General Consideration yet more force as to her particular: The one is, that it being in the King's power to order her either to be *Burnt* or *Beheaded*, the Terror of the former might carry her to say any thing, that might procure her the softer Death: But the other was yet stronger, it was a natural enough Temptation to her, to lead her to confess a precontract, since by that Confession she might hope so far to extinguish the Crime for which she was condemned,

to obtain her Life by that means: She was condemned for Adultery; and the Confession of a pre-contract might be drawn from her, as a thing that dissolved the Marriage, and by consequence acquitted her of the Adultery: which she was condemned, since if he was never the King's true Wife, she could not be guilty towards him: So that this matter was perhaps represented to her, as that which must certainly save her Life. And thus this Confession being grounded on the fears of Death, and carrying in so the hopes of Life, can be of no force in Law.

The bare Confession of a pre-contract without any other Admittance or Evidence to confirm it, cannot be supposed a just ground to dissolve a Marriage; both wife Married persons when they grow weary of one another, may dissolve their Marriage by taking a false Oath. It's true, in other cases the parties own Confession is strong enough in Law against themselves; but in this case both the married persons being equally concerned in the Tie that follows upon it, the Confession of the one cannot dissolve the Right that accrued to the other upon the Marriage; and since two Witnesses are necessary in all such Cases, the Confession of one of the parties is, at most, but the single Evidence of one Witness; and therefore *Mr. Basset's* Confession could not make the Marriage void: This is further confirmed by the Denial of the person with whom the pre-contract was pretended to be made: If her Confession gave such a Credit to the matter, as to annul her subsequent Marriage with the King, it would likewise to have annulled the Earl of *Northumberland's* Marriage; therefore it could not be received in Law. The other circumstances of it do also concur to weaken its credit; it was so secretly carried, that one of the Judges of that time, tells us only that it was reported, that she had confessed a pre-contract; so that it was not managed with the necessary Forms of Justice; and it being probable that some General promise of Marriage had passed between her and the Earl of *Northumberland*, it is not likely that she understood the difference between a Promise and a Contract; so she might, especially in such a Hurry, and under so much disorder, mistake the one for the other.

But in the last place it is to be considered, that there was an Innocent Child in the Case, whose Legitimacy and Right could not be cut off by her Mother's extorted Confession; Infants are more particularly under the protection of the Law; and therefore Acts passed against them in that state of Feebleness have not laws to them, that they have always a right to exercise a remedy to a Noble Witness in such Circumstances as her Mother's were, could not be sufficient to disgrace and dishonour her, and the Confirmation of the Act of Parliament that followed afterwards might have been a forcible bar in Law to her, but could be

no just one; for as a Bastard is still a Bastard, even tho' he were Legitimated by Act of Parliament; so a lawful Child is still what it is, notwithstanding a Sentence of Bastardy confirmed in Parliament; and this is so true, and was so evidently the Practice of that time, that even King *Henry* in his suit of Divorce with Queen *Catherine*, was willing to have his Daughter *Mary* declared Legitimate; because Children begot in a Marriage, are begotten *bona fide*, and so they ought not to suffer, because of the secret fault of their Parents. And if this was yielded in a Marriage where both Parents were according to the Kings Pretensions guilty of Incest, it was much more just in the Case of *Ann Bullen*, even supposing her Precontract true; for her secret fault ought not to blemish, nor ruin her innocent Child. Another Instance that fell out at this time in the Royal Family, is very considerable, and because it is little known, I fancy the Reader will not be displeased to have it particularly opened to him; *Henry* the 8th's Sister that was *Queen of Scotland*, did after her Husband King *James* the 4th's Death, marry the Earl of *Douglas*, and by that Marriage she had a Daughter Lady *Margaret Douglas*. Some time after her Marriage she fell to be in ill terms with her Husband, and discovered a Pre-contract he had given to another; and upon this she sued him in the Spiritual Court; and it being proved the Marriage was annulled; but her Daughter was still held to be Legitimated, and was entertained by King *Henry*, as his Niece, and given by him in Marriage to the Earl of *Lennox*, of whom descended the Lord *Darvly*, that was King *James* the 1st of *England's* Father; and since he was considered to be the Second Person in the Succession to the Crown of *England*, after the Queen of *Scots*; this shews that by the Practice of that Time, a Pre-contract even legally proved; yet did not illegitimate the Issue that were begotten *bona fide* by one of the Parents.

And thus I hope enough is said to overthrow the Objection that is made to the first Constitution of our Church under *Q. Elizabeth*; it was strangely put, and decently and weightily writ, and therefore I have answered it with the like Decency of Style; so that if I treat the Author that I am a going to examine, a little more familiarly, I hope the Reader will not impute it to any roughness of temper in me; for the examining of Matters of Fact or Arguments from Reason, calmly and softly, without any mixture of Sharpness, is a thing so becoming a man and a Christian, that it is not without some Pain to my self, that I find I must sometimes say things that seem too severe: But on the other hand, when one finds he hath to do with much unjust malice, he is carried to an Indignation that even forces him to a Style that would appear too flat, if it were not a little sharpened, when the Provocation is so just: Yet I am so sensible that this Smartness of Ex-

proposition is a thing that is rather to be excused than justified; that I shall watch over my self, lest I be carried too far towards it; for I see there is occasion enough given me by my Author to tempt me to it.

But before I enter upon the matters of fact, I will take the liberty to set down a *Verbal* of our Author's, which shews him as great an Apostate from Loyalty to the King, as he is from the other Doctors of the Church of England. He starts the matter indeed as doubtful, but the bringing of our Allegiance to the King to be disputable, will be according to our Law, a matter of *Premunure* at least. His Words are, *Whether in case that a Prince use his Coarctive Jurisdiction in Spiritual Matters, against the Definitions of the Church, then the Pope hath not also virtually some temporal Coarctive Power against the Prince, namely, to dissolve the Prince's Coarctive Powers, or to authorize others to use a Coarctive Power against such a Prince in order to the good of the Church. This they bring in question; but then as the last is affirmed by some of the Roman Doctors, so it is opposed by others of them.* This is in plain English, that it is disputable, Whether a Pope may not Depose an Heretical Prince, and give his Dominions to another; some Doctors of the Church of Rome holding the Affirmative, and others the Negative, so that according to the Doctrine of Probability, every man may follow the Affirmative with a good Conscience; and this being so invidious a matter, our Author's proposing it as doubtful, without declaring himself against it, is a strong, and even a violent presumption, that he himself is for it. And yet these men boast of their Loyalty.

B. 20. lln.
12.

B. 21.

Our Author insinuates the Nullity of *Ann Bullen's* Marriage, to which I have already given a full Answer. But he supports it by two Arguments of his own making. (1) He says the *Act of Parliament* (28. Hen. 8.) says, that the King was conscious of some Impediments why he could not lawfully marry her. From which he seems to infer, That the Reports of the Kings Familiarity with her Sister, were true: But the *Act of Parliament* mentions only the Queens Condition, and does not say a word of the Kings knowing any such Reasons. (2.) He cites a Clause of a Dispensation pretended to be granted by *P. Clement* the 7th, giving him leave to marry again, to any Person, tho in the first Degree of Affinity, and tho she were unlawfully betroth, and to make this the more Credit, he cites the Words in Latin. But there was no such Dispensation either asked or granted, and this pretended Dispensation was afterwards forged by *Q. Elizabeth's* Enemies to defame her. The Bull of Dispensation, that the King asked, is set down by *Dr. Barrow*, among the Records that he gives us, in which there is no such Clause; and it is plain, that whatever the King's secret intentions might be with relation to *Ann Bullen*, that yet he had

Hist. Re-
form. P. 1.
Rec. Bo. 2.
l. 10.

not declared them, much less moved to have any such extravagant Clause put in the Bull. For in the Letter that the two Legates writ to the Pope, pressing him to grant the Bull, they reject that Imputation that was cast on the King, as if he proceeded in this matter out of an aversion to the Queen, or that he was engaged in it by the Charms of the Person that he intended to marry, *who, perhaps, was not yet known to him*. This way of Writing shews, at least, that it is false, that before this time the King had owned his Design for *Ann Bullen*, much less that he had confessed Acts of Leudnel's with her Sister; otherwise it had been too impudent a thing for the Legates to have writ in this strain: So that I had reason to say, That there were Arguments of our Author's making; and in the matters of Fact, this is the softest Word I can find for them.

Ibid n 24.
Nam qui
Reginæ
odio vel
speratz,
nec dum
forsan no-
te, futuræ
conjugis
illicitibus &
titillatione
Regem
agi putant
ij ex cor-
des plane,
& to to,
quod aiunt
carlo er-
rare vi-
dentur.
Ibid.
P. 22.

II. Our Author falls into the Common Error of Card. *Woolley's* consulting with the King at first, in his Suit of Divorce, and becoming afterwards averse to it, when he discovered his Inclinations to *Ann Bullen*; but her two Letters to the Cardinal, printed by Dr. *Barnet*, shew manifestly the Falshood of this Imagination.

III. He lays a 10000 pounds Charges was demanded by the King from the Clergy, for the expence he had been at in obtaining so many Instruments from the foreign Universities, that had decided this matter; and for the Sums that were given, he cites no better Authors, than some Testimonies produced by *Sanders*. But the Falshood of this Imputation is so manifest, that it appears by Dr. *Crook's* Letters and Accounts, that are yet extant, that he had scarce Money enough allowed him for his own Subsistence; and as the small presents he made were inconsiderable, being only a Crown or two; so in a Letter to the King, he writes in these Words, *Upon pain of my Head, if the contrary be proved, I never gave any man one half Penny before I had his Conclusion to your Highness, without former Prayer or promise of Reward for the same*. By this way of Writing it is plain, that instead of his being instructed and furnished with Money to corrupt Divines, he had positive Orders to the contrary; nor is there any mention in the Act of Parliament, that contains the Grant of the Subsidy of any Expence that the King had been at, how boldly soever it is asserted by our Author. But the citing of an Act of Parliament had an Air of Truth in it, which might deceive an unwary Reader.

Cott. Lib.
Vit. B. 13.

IV. He pretends to lessen the Credit of the Decisions of the Universities, since they had supposed that the first Marriage with *P. P.*

Arthur was consummated, of which he doubts, and proposes the common Objections against it, of *P. Arthur's* Age, and of his dying soon after his Marriage. He also saith, That though the first Marriage had been consummated, many Learned Men (of whom he names only *Fisher* and *Tunstal*, and takes the rest on *Sander's* Words) thought the Pope might dispence with it; and in Conclusion, he cites the Act of Parliament passed in the beginning of *Queen Maries* Reign, condemning her Mothers Divorce, in which mention is made of the Corruption of the Forreign Universities.

(1.) It is true, all the World believed that the first Marriage was consummated, as appears by what *Cajetan* says upon it: But (2.) since our Author cites *Lord Herbert's* History of *King Henry 8th*, he must needs have seen in him, as clear Proofs of a Consummation, as a thing of that nature is capable of. (3.) *Prince Arthur's* early Death was generally imputed to his too early Marriage; and the care that was had of the Princess after his Death, the delay of giving the Title of *Prince of Wales* to the younger Brother, and the mention made of the Consummation of that Marriage, dubiously indeed in the Bull for the second Marriage, but more positively in the suspected Brief, are all as strong Presumptions, as could be brought, for proving a thing of that nature. (4.) *Tunstal* concurred with the King in the Divorce, and in all that followed upon it; so that our Author had need find better Proofs of this, than *Sander's* Word, otherwise he'll hardly gain Credit. (5.) The Learned Men he mentions, come within a very small compass. For as *Cajetan* was the first Author of that Opinion, so he had very few followers in that Age; though the consequences of this Dispute hath drawn the current of the Authors of the *Roman* Communion since that time, to follow his Opinion. (6.) An Act of Parliament made by *Gardner* and others, in the beginning of *Queen Maries* Reign, who were the chief managers of the Suit against her Mother, and who by this Act intended to make their Peace, and their Court with her, is indeed a very venerable Authority, and may very fairly come into the same Paragraph with *Sander*.

P. 25.

V. He pretends that *Cramer* and *Cromwell* were the Authors of the Advice of the King's obliging the Clergy in their Submission to own him for the *Supreme Head of the Church*. It is true, he cites *Amicus Brit.* for this, and for another thing, that whereas the Clergy desired to have qualified that Title with these Words, *In so far, as it is lawful by the Law of Christ*; the King refused this, and the Clergy granted it without that Restriction. Here an Author is pretended; but if the Writer of this Treatise had examined these matters exactly,

ably, he would have found by a Letter of King Henry's to the Convocation of York, that the King had accepted of this Limitation, and indeed the nature of things puts it in, whether it had been set down in so many express Words or not; and as for what is said here of *Cranmer*, it is without ground, for he was then beyond Sea, employed in disputing concerning the Divorce.

Printed
in the Ca-
bala.

VI. He says, *Warham* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* was a favourer of Queen *Katherine's* Cause. This agrees ill with his owning that he saw the Lord *Herbert's* History, in which he might have found *Warham's* Deposition upon Oath, in which he acknowledges, that he thought the Marriage was neither *honourable*, nor *well-pleasing to God*, that therefore he had opposed it much. And *Warham* did set forward the Divorce with so much zeal, that he procured a Writing to be signed by all the Bishops of his Province, declaring that they thought that the Kings Marriage was *Unlawful*, and in this he was so earnest, that when *Fisher* refused to sign it, he pressed him vehemently unto it; but the other said still, that it was against his Conscience, so he made another Person subscribe in *Fisher's* name, and set to his Seal to the Paper, and pretended that he had *Fisher's* leave to do it; which he affirmed before the Legates, when the matter came to be examined. So false is it, that *Warham* favoured the Marriage.

shall be
in the Ca-
bala.

VII. He pretends, that the next step of the Reformation, was the Submission of the Clergy, by which they bound themselves not to Assemble without the Kings Writ, nor to take or execute any Law, unless the King should by his Royal Grant Command them to make or to execute them. But the Proof he cites for this, discovers his Error and Variation evidently. It seems he thought a careless Reader, seeing an Assertion and a Citation following after it, would without reading the long Citation take it for granted, that it agreed with the Assertion, and without being at the pains to read it, would run on to new matter. The Clergy did not bind themselves never to meet, without the Kings Writ. They only said, That the Convocation had ever been, and ought always to be assembled by the Kings Writ, which only shews what is the regular Method of their Assembling themselves. But though this obliges them to meet always when they are required to do it by the Kings Writ; yet it doth not bind them up from meeting, in case the necessities of the Church do require it, and that the King refuses his Writ; for then they are reduced to their prudential Considerations in the managing of their matters in a case of Persecution. Nor did they bind themselves up from execut-

P. 28.

ting

ting the old Canons, but only from the enacting of new ones; which is very different from the view that our Author gives of it, as was made out in the first Part of these Reflections.

P. 39.

25 Henry
8th. n. 14.

VIII. He fastens a very strange Inference on some Words of an Act of Parliament, as if they had amounted to this, That no Laws of the Land, nor the Prerogative assumed by the King, had any thing of *Heresy* in them. If by this is only meant, that the Laws then in being were not Heretical, there is nothing extraordinary in such a Pretension. For a Body in which the Legislative power resides, will very naturally assert its own Orthodoxy; and the bare asserting it, will hardly be thought a Criminal Attempt: But if our Author meant, as probably he did, that by this a Declaration was made for all time coming, that the Laws of the Land should be for ever the Standard of *Heresy*, or sound Doctrine, then the Conclusion will hardly be found in the Authority that he gives us for it, which is an Act, declaring, *That the speaking against those Laws made by the Authority of the See of Rome, by the Policy of Man, which were repugnant to the Laws of the Realm, or the King's Prerogative, should not be judged Heresy.* This is an Inference worthy the Sincerity of its Author. In the Body of the Canon Law, they are many Laws made that destroy all Civil Government whatsoever, and that subject Princes wholly to the Pope. There are also many Laws made relating to Civil matters, *in Ordine ad Spiritualia*, but all to be sure for advancing the Interests of that Court from which they came. Now the Civil Courts in *England* were already in Possession of giving a check to the Spiritual Courts, and of granting Prohibitions upon their Judgments, even in Cases of *Heresy*, when the Spiritual Courts had judged men Hereticks for *Articles* that were not *Heretic*; as we may see lie for the like cases in *France*, so that the Parliament made only a Regulation in this manner, which is at this day practised in most of all the States of *Chrestendom*. Otherwise Civil Government were a very feeble thing, if it could not preserve its Members from the arbitrary Proceedings of Ecclesiastical Courts. And indeed, if the Canons and Rules made by the Popes, and such Synods as were absolutely at their disposal, were the measures of *Heresy*, so that Judgments ought to pass upon them, and that States might not cover themselves from them by Laws, we know where this must carry us, and how many Bonfires must be quickly made in *England*. But God be thanked, it is not come to that. I must also add one thing, That in the Judgment of *Heresy* had carried with it nothing, but the Ecclesiastical Censures of Excommunications and Anathemas, the Church might have pretended that the State ought not to meddle too much

in it. But since Heresy not only drew after it an Infamy in Law, but likewise a *Writ de Hæresis Quærendo*, according to another *Case* acknowledged to be in force by our Author; then a *Statute* ought to have made such Regulations in this matter, as were necessary to protect its Members from such a Butchery. For since the Civil Government is bound to secure the Subjects, while they continue Innocent and Obedient, from the Rage of all their Enemies; our Legislators had betrayed their Trust, if they had not put an effectual Stop to the Tyranny of the Clergy. And thus it is plain, That this Declaration made by the Parliament, was nothing like a securing to the Subjects their *Lives* and *Fortunes*, to which they had formerly a very doubtful Tenure, since they held them only at the Discretion and Mercy of the Clergy.

IX. But because our Writers have often alledged the Laws made in former times, chiefly by the *Sacros of Primaries* made by Richard the 1st against all Bulls and Privileges from the See of Rome; Our Author answers this very weightily, as he thinks, by shewing us, That those Laws related only to some special matters that were temporal Things; such as the *Tithes to Bishops*, or the *Translation of Bishops out of England*, without the *King's consent*; by which, both the King might be deprived of their Council, and the Treasures of the Kingdom carried away out of it. But all this is trifling. For a Contest being raised concerning the extent of the Popes Power, the Pope claims a degree of Authority to be committed to him by Christ, and that the whole Pastoral Work belonged to him. Upon this the King and Parliament set bounds to it. Now the Question arises out of this, whether the same Authority that warranted them to determine against the pretensions of that Court in that one Point, did not warrant them likewise to do it in other Points. To a Man of a clear understanding, the matter will appear to be past dispute. For if in one Point a Parliament may contradict the Popes Declarations and Canons, sure it may do it in another; and the only Question then to be examined, will be concerning the matter of fact. For if the matter of fact is good, the Authority is certainly good; and if the matter is not good, it is confessed that an Act of Parliament cannot change the nature of things.

But because this matter is better understood by some Breves printed by Dr. Storer, it will be worth the while to examine it a little more fully. That vigorous Act of Parliament came out indeed in the Reign of a feeble Prince, but the Popedom in that time was in a more feeble State; and the adherence of England to the Pope, who sat at Rome, was in that time of Schism so valuable a support, that those at Rome (it seems) thought it fit to take no notice of it. But the Council of Constance had no sooner heard that Wound, then the Popes were resolved to have that Law repealed, and England falling again under a new Feebleness in Henry 6th Minority, and

Factions.

Hist. R. &
form. Rec.
b. 2. n. 37.
38, 39.

Efficient to Home, and Loss in France, having sunk the Reputation of the Government extremely, the Pope laid hold of that Conjecture; and in his Letters both to the Arch-bishops and Clergy, and to the King and Parliament, he Annul'd this Statute, and requires the Clergy to give it no Obedience, declaring all Persons that obey it, to be *ipso facto* Excommunicated, and they should not be relaxed by any but himself, unless it were at the point of Death; and he ordered the Clergy to Preach this Doctrine to all the People. He required the Parliament under pain of Damnation to Repeal it, and he founds his right in the Commission that Christ gave to St. Peter to feed the Flock. Here, sure, if ever, the Pope speaks *Ex Cathedra*; yet for all this, the Parliament would neither Repeal nor explain the former Statute. By all which it is plain, that our Parliament did not think themselves bound to be born down by big words, and high pretensions. In this Dispute then, between the Spiritual and Temporal Power, we see the Parliament judg'd the matter; and by the same right that they judg'd one Point, they may judge other Points; and if the matter of their Judgment was good, their Judgment was as valid under *Henry* the Eighth, as under *Richard* the Second, or *Henry* the Sixth. For the Point being once yielded, that the Civil Authority may examine the Decisions of the Church, then this may be certainly carried to other particulars, or applied to a greater extent of matter, as further discoveries of Truth, and new Provocations may arise.

P. 51.

X. The Affinity of the matter leads me here to make a leap over several Particulars, which I will afterwards review, and to examine that which our Author hath thought fit to say concerning the burning of Heretics; only by the way I must take notice of the unjust Recital that he makes of the two Statutes made against Heretics under *Henry* the Fourth and *Henry* the Fifth which he represents if they had merely left the Judgment of Heretics to the Ordinary or Diocesan, without any thing else; by which the Repeal of them must appear to be the taking away that Judgment from the Spiritual Courts; but there were other and more important Clauses in those Acts, which gave the Parliament just Reason to Repeal them. In the former, the Civil Magistrates are required to be personally present at the giving of Sentence against Heretics; and after the Sentence was passed, they were to receive them, and then to *burn the People, in a high place to be seen.* Here was the poisonous Sting in that Act, which our Author was not faithful enough to mention; and in that part by *Henry* 5th, all Magistrates required to take an Oath when they entered upon their employments, *That they should use their whole Power and Diligence to destroy all Heresies and Errors called Lollards, and to assist the Ordinaries and the Commissioners in their Proceedings against them; and all commit of Lollardy were to forfeit all the Lands that they held in Fee-simple, as well as their Goods.*

Goods and Chattels to the King. These were the true Motives of repealing those Bloody Laws; which our Author ought to have mentioned if he had not designed to deceive his Reader; but when he comes to examine the matter of *Burning Hereticks*, he does it so softly, that it is plain he would rather lay us asleep than quiet us. First he begins with that trifling Answer, P. 78, 79. That the Secular Laws, and not the Ecclesiastical, do both appoint and execute it; but if the Secular Arm is threatened by the Ecclesiastical, not only with lower Censures, but even with Deposition and that by a Council, which he acknowledges to be general, in case they do not extirpate Hereticks, then this Extirpation is still the Act of the Church, enforced upon the Civil Power with a dreadful Sanction, which the Church was Able to execute in those Ages of Superstition; and thus the Guilt of all the Blood-shed upon the account of Heresie lyes at the Door of that Church. In the next place he reckons up several Instances of severe Executions against Hereticks both in England and elsewhere, which were practiced not only in *Henry* the Eighth's time, but also under *Edward* the Sixth's; and were carried on chiefly by *Craumer's* Authority: Executions made under *Queen Elizabeth* and *King James*, are also mentioned; to which is added a Law made by *King James*, adjudging men Traytors for being reconciled to the Pope, or See of; which is, putting men to Death for pretended Heresie, and to a Death worse than Burning. But to all this I will only say, That the Reformation being a work of time, as men did not all at once throw off all the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, so this being the received Doctrine of the *Western* Church for many Ages, that all Hereticks ought to be extirpated; if our Reformers did not, so soon as were to be wished, throw of this Remnant of Popery, it is rather to be excused and pitied in them, than to be justified from their Practice: *Craumer* did also foster the Notion of Heresie as much as he could, by reducing it to a plain and wilful Opposition to some of the Articles of the *Apostles Creed*; and if the constant Clamour that the men of the Church of *Rome* raised against the Reformation, as a Subversion of the Christian Religion, because some that had been among the Reformers, advanced some monstrous Opinions; if these I say, carried our Reformers to such a way of justifying themselves of this Impiety, which I do not pretend to justify, ought not to reproach us for that to which they owe our Ancestors. As for *King James's* Law, I will not examine whether the Death of Traytors, or the Burning of Hereticks, is the more dreadful; it is certain, *Fire*, especially when it is slow, is the most terrible of all deaths, and that which gives the most formidable Impression; but if the Provocation given to the King and Parliament at that time by the *Gunpowder Treason*, be considered, it will not appear strange, if the King and Parliament, after they had escaped so narrowly the greatest

of all dangers, took a little more than ordinary Care to secure themselves against the like Attempt in time coming. And if the severe Canour of the Council of *Latre* against Hereticks had bin as so many dead Letters in the Body of the Laws of their Church, as that Law hath done in our Book of *Seacutes*, they had had much less Blood to answer for, and less guilt than lies upon them at present. After these *sumings*, our Author comes to pass his own Censure on the Burning of Hereticks; but the common Rules of Prudence should have led him in the present juncture of Affairs to have condemned it roundly, and so to have laid our apprehensions a little; yet he says so plainly, that this was a practise so clearly authorized both by Law and Custom in their Church, that he durst not disown it in express words; and indeed he understands so little, how a tender point ought to be touch'd, that by all the Rules of Prudence, he ought not to have meddled with it. His Discourse in this is an Original; and because I do him no wrong in the manner of Representing it, I will set it down in his own Words.

"But whether this Law in it self be just; and against justice whether it may be justly extended to all those simple People put to death in *Querra* *Morta* days (such as *St. Austin* calls *Hereticks Credentes*) because they had so much Obligation to see to rectify their Errors for which they saw their former Teachers sacrifice their Lives especially when they were prejudiced by the most common & ordinary Doctrine and Practice in the precedent Times of *Antiquity*; and had lived in such a condition of Life, as neither had means nor sufficient capacity to train in the Churches Authority, Councils or Fathers, ordinarily such Persons being only to be reduced (as those were perceived) by the ordinary fashion and course of the times, and by Example; and not by Argument, either from Reason or from Authority; and the same that I say of these *Lays*, may perhaps also be said of some illiterate Clergy; whether, I say, this Law may justly be extended to such, and the highest suffering Death be inflicted (especially where the Delinquents are so numerous) rather than some lower Censure of penitentiary, Mults or Imprisonment; these things I meddle not with, nor would I be thought at all in this place to justify the same.

"I will here not say a long Period of Words, before the Verbi comes to close it, but there is a small compass in all this; and even after our Author hath put the Case with all possible Abatement, and as soft as may be of charge against the strong prejudice, and the numbers of the Delinquents and immoderate merciful inclination only towards the *Lays*, and some of the illiterate Clergy; and that only with relation to Death; Fines and imprisonment notwithstanding of the Grace that he would shew us, yet in conclusion he says to us, that we shall not be able to see the same, nor could he himself do it.

justify it in this place; for he is only concerned what we think of him, and whether he justifies it or not; he only tells us he would not be thought to do it; and yet lest that seem too much, he adds a further Qualification, that he would not be thought to justify it in this place: So that he hath fully reserved all his Rights entire to a fitter opportunity and then he well may, without the least reproach, justify that in another place, which he doth not think fit to do at present: Yet it seems he hath a very narrow heart, in matters of Grace; for this same scanty measure of Favour that he had clogg'd with so many Reserves, is yet retrenched considerably in the following Words.

"Tho some among those unlearned Lay-people, I confess to have been extremely arrogant, and obstinate, and zealous beyond knowledge, and tho they had suffered for a good Cause, yet suffering for it on good or reasonable grounds, as neither themselves, being any way learned, nor pretending the Authority of any Church, nor relying on any present Teachers, but on the certainty of their own private Judgment, interpreting Scripture as you may see. And here some Instances are given; but if this Period will close it self it may; for our Author, who seldom takes care of such small matters, leaves it in this unfinished condition. I will not examine the truth of this Maxim, but will only take notice, that since all Protestants agree in this, that the Ground of our Faith is that which appears to us to be the Sense of the Scripture, our Author hath by this Limitation of his former gentleness towards us, delivered us all over to the Secular Arm; and so God have Mercy on our Souls, for it is plain he will have none upon our Bodies.

XL He quarrels with the Privy-Council, for imprisoning of *Banier*, because he said he would observe the Injunctions that were sent him, if they were not contrary and repugnant to Gods Law, and to the Statute and Ordinance of the Church; the fault imputed here to him, I suppose, being that he refused to obey any Injunctions of the King, when repugnant to the Statute and Ordinance of the Church: But since he had a mind to blacken that time, he might have as well said, that they found fault with him, because he promised to obey the Injunctions, if they were not contrary to Gods Law; and that thereby it appeared, that they preferred their Injunctions to the Laws of God, as well as to the Laws of the Church; and by our Author's taking no notice of the first branch of *Banier's* Exception, it may be inferred, That all his Concern is about the Laws of the Church, and so they be secured, he troubles himself little what becomes of the LAW of God: But if he had weighed this matter as he ought to do, he would have found that this Exception is very ill grounded. When a Form of a Subscription is demanded, there is no Government in the World, that will accept of one that indeed signifies nothing at all: for it is visible that a Subscription made with those Reserves, signifies nothing:

P. 57.

nothing : therefore if *Dr. A.* had acted as became his Character, he should have directly refused the Subscription of such Injunctions, as he found to be contrary to the Laws of God, or to such Laws of the Church as he thought bound his Conscience : But the Profession he made, gave a very just ground to the Government to proceed against him according to Law.

P. 58.

XII. Our Author intending to aggravate the Proceedings against *Gardiner*, shews his great Judgment in setting down the Article relating to the Kings Supremacy at full length ; whereas he had only named the others ; for he could have invented nothing that must needs render all his Exceptions to the King's Supremacy more visibly unjust, than this doth, which is in these Words : *That his Majesty as Supreme Head of the Church of England, hath full Power and Authority to make and see forth Laws, Ordinances and Ordinances concerning Religion and Orders in the said Church, for repressing all Errors and Heresies, and other Enormities and Abuses ; so that the same Alteration be not contrary or repugnant to the Scriptures or Law of God.* This was no other than what *Gardiner* had over and over again both by his Oaths and his Writings advanced ; and the restriction set on it was so just, that one would think there lay no possible Exception to it. Here there is no claim to the declaring what were Errors and Heresies, but only to the repressing them ; and this is done by the Secular Arm, even where Men are burnt for Heresie : Besides the Power, that according to our Author, belongs to the Pastors of the Church, is either founded on the Scriptures, or it is not ; if it is not founded on the Scriptures, there is no great regard to be had to it ; but if it is founded on it, then it is clearly excepted by the words of this Article, so it is hard to see of what use this is to our Author, unless it be to shew him his Injustice.

P. 64.

XIII. He tells us, That all that which had been done under King *Henry* and King *Edward*, was Annulled by an equal Authority under *Q. Mary*. But tho' I acknowledg he was both the Sovereign, and the Parliament ; yet there was neither Justice nor Moderation in the Charge now made, equal to what had been done before. A great deal might be said concerning the Election of the Members of Parliament, and the Practices upon them, and of the turning out a Multitude of the Clergy before the Laws were changed. The Disorders and irregularities in the Dispositions had nothing of that fair Dealing to them that had appeared in *K. Edward's* Time ; and whereas all the Severity of *K. Henry's* days, was the imprisoning of three or four Bishops and the turning out of some of the other Clergy, he knows well how matters went under *Q. Mary*. So that we cannot be denied this Glory, that a Spirit of Justice and Moderation appear'd at every time that the Reformation prevail'd. Whereas things went much otherwise in this sad Revolution, in which

which our Author glories so much. So that if the good or ill Behaviours of the several Parties, as they had their turns in the Administration of Affairs, furnish a just Prejudice, even in favour of the Cause it self, we have this on our side as fully as we can wish for.

XIV. He tells us, That the Bishoprick of *Durham* was first kept void in King *Edward's* days, and last of all it was by Act of Parliament dissolved to increase the Kings Revenue. If our Author had examined the Records of Parliament, he would have found that the Act that related to the Bishoprick of *Durham*, did not at all propose the Increase of the Kings Revenue, but the dividing of one Bishoprick into two; and the raising and endowing of a new Cathedral Church, all which must have risen to about four thousand Marks of old Rents, which considering how long Lands were let near the Borders, did certainly very near exhaust the whole Revenue of that See. This is indeed of no great Importance to the main Cause. For if Sacrilegious Men went into the Reformation, hoping to enrich themselves by it, this is nothing but what falls out in all great Revolutions. And it is plain our Author took up general Reports very easily, that so he might make a Clamour with them against our Church. But if some that gave an outward Compliance to the Doctrine of our Church, were really a Reproach to it, he of all Men for a certain Reason, ought not to insist on it. Since we are no more accountable for the Duke of *Northumberland's* Actions, than we are for his own.

XV. He tells us, That the Bishops turned out by Queen *Mary*, P. 71. were Ejected, because the greater part of them were married, upon which he gives some grounds to justify that Sentence.

I will not here examine the Point of the Unlawfulness of the Marriage of the Clergy. It is not so much as pretended to be found on Scripture; and the Discipline of the Church hath been; and is to this day very various in that Matter. But this is certain, that a Law being made in King *Edward's* Days, allowing the Marriage of the Clergy, the Queen upon the Repeal of that Law, granted a Commission to some Bishops to examine four of King *Edward's* Bishops, and to try if they were married, and upon that to deprive them. This was an Act of the Queens Civil Power; so that the Deprivation, according to our Author's own Principles, was done by Virtue of that Commission, and was by consequence void. It was also most unjust with Relation to the Civil Power. For these Bishops having been married under the Protection of a Law that warranted

it, that Law will still justify them for what was passed: and the Re-
peal of it, though it might empower the Queen to proceed for the
future against those of the Clergy that should contract Marriage,
yet it was against all the Rules of Justice to deprive them by Virtue
of a Commission from the Queen, for an Action that was warranted
by a Law then in being. But there was another more extravagant
Commission by which three other Bishops are represented as not hav-
ing believed themselves well, and that as the Queen credibly under-
stood, they had both preach'd erroneous Doctrine, and had carried
themselves contrary to the Laws of God, and the Practice of the
Universal Church. And therefore She orders these Persons to pro-
ceed against them, either according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, or
the Laws of the Land, and declare their Bishoppicks void, as they
were called already void. Now our Author will then his great Reas-
oning from inference that cannot be dissolved, if he can find a Precedent
for such a Commission as this is, in all History, or a Warrant for it,
among all those Cases for which he pretends to much Respect and
Zeal. And thus he hath, A Deposition of seven Bishops done by
the King's Authority, and without so much as the colour of Justice.

P. 31d. **XVI.** The second Reason he gives for their Deposition, was their
not acknowledging of any Supremacy in the *Roman Pontiff*; and
here, as elsewhere, he seems to plead for no higher Authority so
the Pope, but that of a *Remonstrance*. But not to repeat what was said
upon this in the general Considerations, the acknowledging of that
Power in the Pope, would not have served turn. It was never de-
manded of the Clergy, and would certainly not have been ac-
cepted.

P. 72. **XVII.** Another Reason was their refusing to officiate according to
the Liturgies received, and used by the whole Catholick Church, for
near 2000 years. There is some modesty in this Promotion,
which carries up the Age to higher than 1000 years. Though,
as to the greater part of them, and the ground of them all, which
is the Adoration of the Host, there is no just claim to the half of that
Antiquity. Yet if the Church of Rome will give us the first 500
years, we will not be much concerned in the 1000 that comes next.
Our Author speaks not wide when he saith the whole Catholick
Church, he should have said the *Roman Church*, if he would have
spoke exactly: And for this Promotion in a 1000 years, any that
will compare the Missals that have been printed by *Card. Bellarmine*
and *P. Addison*, with the present *Roman Missal*, will soon find
that

that the *Roman* Missal of the last Age, was far different from what it had been for a 1000 years before. There is one Particular in which indeed they seem both to agree, and yet by which the change of the Doctrine of the Church is very conspicuous in the so much disputed Point concerning the Presence in the Sacrament. After the 1st Century, that a sort of an Invocation of Saints was received, by which, though they were not immediately prayed to, yet Prayers were put up to God to hear us, upon the account of their Intercession. There are some Prayers in some Ancient Missals that mention the offering up of that Sacrifice to their Honour, and that pray God to accept of it on the account of their Intercession. Now in the Opinion of the Church of *England*, that considers the Communion, as a commemorative Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and as a Sacrifice of Praise that is offered up to God upon it; these Words bear a good Sense, which is, that to honour the Memory of such Saints, their Holy days were Days of Communion; and this Action is prayed to be accepted of God, on the account of their Intercession. In which there is nothing to be blamed, but the Superstition of praying to God with regard to their Intercession. But one sees a good Sense in those Collects. Yet these very Collects are Nonsense, or down-right Blasphemous in the present State of the *Roman* Church, in which the Sacrifice of the Mass is believed to be the very Body and Blood of Christ, which are there offered up, to as to be a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Dead and the Living. Now to say, That this is offered up to the Honour of a Saint, or to pray that it may be accepted by Virtue of their Intercession, is the most extravagant and impious thing that can be imagined. So that this change of Doctrine hath rendered the Cases of the Mass, even in those things for which they can pretend to some Authority, both impious and Blasphemous in the Opinion and Sense which is now generally received in that Church.

XVIII. Our Author censures a Clause in an Act passed in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, in which it is declared, That in the Fifth Year of Parliament, with the Assent of the Clergy in their Convocation; as if by this the Clergy could not pass a Judgment of Heresie, without the Concurrence of the Parliament. But Heresie being declared a Crime, that incurred a Civil Punishment, the Parliament had all right Reason, so make their own Concurrence necessary to a Judgment, upon which many Civil Effects were to follow. If the Judgment of Heresie went no further than Spiritual

P. 24

Censures, shew this Limitation upon the Clergy might be blamed a little. What is said, but what is practised at present in France, in which the Censures that the present Pope issued in May 1679, condemning some of the important Opinions of the Modern Casuists, was declared to be of no force, because it issued from the Pope with the Consent of the *Universities*, which is not received in that Kingdom. And neither the Bulls of Popes, nor the Decrees of Council are of any force there, but as they are verified in Parliament, though their Parliaments come far short of the Authority of ours.

P. 90.

XIX. Our Author writes to King Henry the Eighth's abrogating those Laws that were established by the Authority of the Bishop of Rome, as if this included all those Laws that were passed by the Councils, in which Popes presided, since the Canon Law is composed of Synodals, as well as of Papal Laws. In this we will freely own to him, that since the time that the Popes have so far enslaved the Bishops, as to make them swear Obedience to them, we look upon all the Laws that have been made in Synods, composed of Men so pre-engaged, as Papal Laws; but this doth not at all touch those Laws that passed before that Authority was claimed. And indeed there never was a greater Abuse put on the World, than the whole Canon Law. For, as for the first and sanest part of it, which is Gratian's Decree, it was only a Comment, since first drawn up by a Man that was indeed, considering the Age in which he lived, of great Learning and good Judgment. But he was at that time so ill furnished with all necessary helps to make him judge rightly of his Matter, that it is an impudent thing in the Ages of more Knowledge, to pretend to keep up the Credit of a Book that was composed in so dark, and so corrupt a Time. The rest is yet worse, made up of Papal Constitutions, or the Decrees of those ignorant and back-stumbling Councils, that had met for the three Ages preceding the Reformation. If King Henry had abrogated the Ancient Canons, our Author might have had some colour for his Complaints. But the total abrogating of that course Compilation of the Canon Laws, which never was founded on any good Authority, was to sell a thing, that there are very few Learned Men in the Roman Communion at present, that will not say it were well for the Church if it were quite laid aside, since now as then but such as our Author are ashamed of it.

48. 7

P. 93.

XX. Our Author writes as if he intended to do Honour to the Memory of King Henry. For he cites these Words out of his Preface to his Instructions, *Which Agreement of the Clergy for a Bull is de-*

that he has proceeded of a good right and true Judgment, and is to be reversible to the Laws and Ordinances of God; He thereupon ordered it to be published. An ordinary man would be upon this induced to approve mightily of the King's method. First to authorize the Clergy to examine those Matters, and after that, to review their Determinations himself, before he gave his civil Sanction to them. Would our Author have a Prince rely blindly on a National Clergy, which is subject to Error, as is acknowledged by all the World? What Judgment then can he follow but his own? The Civil Power must be applyed in matters of Religion, as is acknowledged on all hands, upon the Judgment of the Prince. For he can follow no other, even in the Principles of the Church of Rome, except when he is determined by an infallible Court, which is only in a General Council.

XXI. Among the other Exorbitances of the King's Supremacy, one reckoned up by our Author is his taking away the Pope's Authority as Patriarch, in confirming the Metropolitans, and his requiring his Clergy, under the Pains of Excommunication, to consecrate into Bishopsricks any that he shall nominate. It is great Ignorance, or somewhat worse in our Author, if he will pretend that the Authority of the Pope over Metropolitans was of primitive Antiquity: For by the Council of Nice, every Province was an entire Body within itself; if the Clergy is under some servitude as to the promoting those nominated by the King, the Pope is under the same to the King of France by the Councils; and our Subjection in this Point, does not bind our Conscience, but lies only on our Persons and Benefices; and therefore when a case of Persecution comes, we must resolve to venture on a Protest, and worse things could we are pressed here.

P. 99.

XXII. He adds to this another gross mistake in History, intimating that the Suppression of Monasteries was done by virtue of this Supremacy; upon which he runs but into a long definition of many Particulars relating to that Affair; but this is all so false, that the Supremacy was not so much as once pretended in it; it went all upon Acts of Parliament, and the consent of the Monks. If the King acted violently and unjustly in this matter, it doth not at all concern the Reformation, and much less his Supremacy; and as for all the Topics of Sacrilege and Profanation, and the alienation of Things, and the Violation of Persons Sacred, these are general and dreadful words, which lose their Horror when it is considered; That the vast endowments of Monasteries were the effects of the Superstition of those Ages, in which the belief of the Redemption out of Purgatory, by the saying of so many Masses, together with many false Miracles, had prevailed so far on the Ignorance and Credulity of the World, as to draw the best part of the Wealth of Europe into those Houses; when, I

P. ibid.

say not only the Ecclesiastical Lives of many Monks, which were indeed but Personal Things, but their falls Miracles and Relicks, and above all (that fallmost of relieving men out of Poverty by their means, were discovered, no doubt it was lawful to dissolve all these Endowments, and to turn their Wealth to better uses; and if the King did not enough this way, it was so much the worse for him; but that doth not at all blemish the Reformation. So that all the long digestion he makes upon this Head, is impertinent to the business in hand, which is the Supremacy.

P. 108.

XXIII. He says, That the Pope pretends no such Power, as to *diminish the Church Revenues for to spend them himself, or to dispose of them in what manner, or to what Persons he pleases; but only for some just Cause, that is, in a prudential Arbitration, for some great benefit ensuing to the Church, or Christianity.* I do not know, if the Pope, or a great many other Princes, that have been raised out of the Patrimony of the Church, would judge this to be good Doctrine; and if the Church is always a *corpus*, so that the Bargains made in her name may be ever recalled, it would be hard to find what Benefit hath arisen to the Church or Christianity out of the Robberies that Princes have made to raise their Families; and it is a strange piece of Impudence in these men, who are always reproaching us with what some of our Princes did in the time of the Reformation, when all that put together, doth not amount to the Iniquities that have been committed in one single Family: case of those whom they would have us look on as God's Tensiles, and as Christ's Vicars; if they are not concerned in those sins, are the Spiritual Heads of their Church, much less are we bound to justify all the Actions of those who are only the Civil and Temporal Heads of our Church.

P. 110.

XXIV. He tells us that the Monks *would not give away that which they had, only for some of their Lands, nor have this power to be delivered by our Author, at a time when the surrender of so many Charters to the King hath been made; and that it was made by men who had no Title to them, and who were to be far from having a Right to them; and that they had only the Administration of them in an Annual Magnificence; so that our Author had best consider how he advances such Positions, lest he doth as much hurt one way, as he thinks to do service another. For our Author hath divided the Cattle of the Monasteries, and hath assigned the Subjection of them largely, though as he said concerning the burning of Heretics, *he would not be thought to be so far from the Truth as to say that the**

XXV. He accuses King Henry for giving Dispensations in matters of Marriage against Ecclesiastical Canons, and because he declared all Marriages to be lawful, that were not against God's Law. Here it is in nothing, the prevalence of the Church of Rome appears, or rather their design to oblige the World to have an account to them, to pay their will, and to depend much on them; they have prohibited Marriage in many degrees, that were not forbid by the Law of God; and to ballance this, they have suffered Marriages to be contracted in the Degrees forbid by God; for the Pope's Power of Dispensing is promoued both ways; they have added a new Continuance of Spiritual Kindred; and as the Prohibitions that they have (for us were unknown to the Ancient Church, so the Degrees that they have declared dispensable, were believed by the Ancient Church to be moral and indispensable. And yet after all this corruption of Ecclesiastical Discipline they are in great wrath at the Reformers, because they thought it was fit to return to the Degrees forbid by the Law of God, and to cut off these superadded Prohibitions, which were inventions to bring graft to that Mill, where all things were to be had, for men will come up to the Price. There follow here a great many instances, in which King Henry exercised his Supremacy, which our Author aggravates all he can. But the Considerations that were proposed in the last Part, seem fully to satisfy all the difficulties that can be thought to arise out of them.

XXVI. He shews, that such of the Privy Council, as complied not with the Changes made in King Edward's Days, were turned out, and some banished, and some banished, *Writbesly* the Chancellor, and the Earl of *Arundel*, and he adds, that the King had but one Parliament, continued by Prorogation from Session to Session, till at last it ended in the Death of the King. Here are Matters of no great Consequence, I think: but here then how carefully our Author was in examining the Story of our Reformation, and how easy he was to take up any Report that might blast it. It will not appear a very extraordinary thing to see Privy Counsellors turned out, that do not concur with the Designs that prevail. Some such things have possibly fallen out in our own Times, and Men have no great cause to complain of a severe Administration, when this is all the Rigour that is shewed to those who oppose themselves to the *Yea*. But our Author was misinformed in all these Particulars. *Thomas* went along with all that was done, and was contented to proceed in Parliament against some Laws, but as soon as they were made, he gave a ready Obedience to them, and continued to be still in the Council, during the Duke of *Somerſet's* Ministry.

171 • *W*ithin a winter passed one Mr. John Jones, but immediately upon King Edward's Death, he being an ill-fated Prince, upon which to mention a former sentence, he sold his Place, but he continued still to be of the Privy Council. And the Earl of Arundel continued to be of the Privy Council for many Years, and long after fell to be in ill terms with the Duke of Northumberland; and upon that an Enquiry was made into his Administration, and he was fined 10000 Pounds. But it is no wonder to find our Author mistaken in matters of this Nature, when in so publick a thing, as that King Edward had but one Parliament in his whole Reign, he hath not been at the pains to turn over the Book of Statutes; for there he would have found, that King Edward's first Parliament was dissolved the 15th of April 1327, and a Second Parliament was called, and opened the First of March following, and was dissolved the last Day of that same Month. So that there were two Parliaments in this Reign, and the Second was dissolved by an Act of the Kings, and not by his Death. I do confess there are not great Matters; yet that may be drawn out of them, that our Author, who pretends to have examined the Transactions of that Time, with so much exactness, took things upon trust, without giving himself the trouble to enquire into them so critically, as was necessary for one that was resolved to pass a Judgment upon them.

P. 127.

XXVII. He expostulates upon the Inhibition of preaching put upon the Bishops, except in their own Cathedrals; which starts all with the Censure that her judges were given, as Divine Persons. And after that there was a general inhibition on the whole Clergy, hindring them to preach, all a University Order of Doctrine should be set out, in which some Bishops, and other Learned Men, were then employed by the King's Order. As for this Inhibition upon Bishops to preach, except in their Cathedrals, it is a Fiction of our Author's, for which he can give no Voucher; they were not so much as restrained from giving Discourses in parish churches, much less as prevent themselves over their Dioceses. The same and general Restriction, as it was but for a very short while, so the Thing is very notorious, and stands only on Fale's Credit, who was too careless a Writer to be appealed to in any Manner of Consequence.

P. 134.

XXVIII. Our Author cites here the Discourse of *Commons* in one Place, which by all appearance is that lately writ by the *Bishop of Meaux*. This shews that the Author and the Publisher is the same Person; though others pretend that the Author is dead many Years ago. But it seems the Publisher thought fit at least to add some new

couplets

touchers, and since he did that, he might have thought it worth the while to have examined at least the Records published by Dr. Barrow, and his History it self might have been considered as well as Mr. Fales and Dr. Heylin. But since it seems our Author thought the Discourse of the Communion in one kind fit to be recommended by him, I will take the liberty to recommend the Answer to it in French by *Monsieur Laroque*, and that lately writ in English, in which the dissimilarity of the Discourse mentioned by our Author, is laid open beyond all possibility of replying.

XXIX. He tells us, that the Veneration of Images was defined in a General Council, *the Second Nicene*, which Council also justifies it by Antiquity. That Council hath been lately sufficiently exposed by a Learned and Judicious Pen. It was neither a General Council nor did it justify what it defined by Antiquity. The falshood of some of their Allegations, and the Imperinences of the rest, and the Inferences drawn from those pretended Authorities, are all such extravagant Things, that they give a just prejudice against every thing that was defined by Men that were equally void of sincerity, and of common sense.

XXX. There follows from this to the end of the Chapter, a long and laborious Vindication of the Clergy in King *Edward's* Time, in which our Author endeavours, by many Instances, of which some were mentioned in the *First Part*, to make it appear that the Clergy at that time gave only an outward compliance, that they acted against their Conscience, that the Severity of that Time, tho it went no further than to the ejecting them out of their Benefices, who refused to comply, and to the imprisoning of a very few, yet wrought so much upon their weakness, and their love of Money, that against their Persuasions they complied, both in Subscribing, Swearing, and Officiating in the Divine Service. This shews our Author's sound and good Judgment, that leads him to fancy, that he hath by this Plea done any thing but blackned them in the most infamous manner that can be imagined. It had been much less scandalous upon them to have owned that many of them were weak and easy Men, ignorant and tractable, and so were apt to be seduced; but that in *Q. Mary's* Time they returned again to their old Persuasions. But this would not have served our Author's turn, who wanted somewhat to excuse his own treacherous Compliance against his Conscience for so many Years, even after he had all that Conviction, which he owns in his Book. But if he hopes to excuse his Crimes, by shewing that his own Church hath produced in former Times Men as black and as

criminal

criminal as himself, he does not carry him this Apology. He might perhaps have another design in it, but of the same size of Sincerity and good Judgment with the other. He no doubt fancied, as many more perhaps did, that the Church of England had many more such false Brethren as *Himself* in her Bosom, who wanted only good Occasions and a fair Occasion to declare themselves, and so as he had been preparing many Books, with which he hoped to overthrow us, when ever the time of publishing them should come: he fancied this Representation that he gives of the Compliance of the Popish Party might offer to others like himself some excuse for their dissembling so long with God and Man, only that they might enjoy the Profits of a Benefice: since it cannot be so much as pretended, that there was any other Temptation in the case. But God be thanked he hath had few Companions in his Apostacy or Treachery, let him choose which he will.

P. 142.

XXXI. Our Author cites a Passage out of a Letter of *Q. Mary* written in her Brother's time to the Privy-Council, in which there is a Period that overthrows a great many of his Assertions. She says that she was well assured, that the King her Fathers Laws were all altered and consumed in without compulsion by the whole Realm, both Spiritual and Temporal. Now if the former part of the Citation he produces makes a little against the Changes in King *Edward*'s time, the latter part is as strong in the justification of that which was done under *Q. Mary*. I cannot leave this without taking notice of our Author's way of citing, which gives the justest cause of Suspicion that can be. The words he cites are, *I have offended no Law, neither is it a late Law of our own making, for the altering Matters of Religion, which is not worthy to have the Name of a Law*, both for *the* and for the Personality used in the same. Now did ever Man before our Author put an *and* in such a place? I have not met by me, from whom this is cited, but I am sure this way of citing a Sentence does not look fair.

P. 157.

XXXII. I will over many Particulars, which are Reflections of things that have been already considered, relating to the Instances in which the Kings Supremacy was exercised. Only where he complains of the removing the Canon the Lacey, as contrary to the Injunction of the Council of *Cardinal*. I must acknowledge his Sincerity in not pretending to carry the Violation of our Saviour's Institution of the Sacrament higher than the 15th Century. We are not ashamed to own that our Reformers thought it better to follow the first 14 Centuries, specially since our Lord's Institution was at the Head

Head of them, then so late and so treacherous an Assembly; that had overthrown all the Confidence that can be among Men, as well as it had sacrilegiously robbed the People of a Right that was derived to them by our Saviour's express Words.

XXXIII. He quarrels the Form of Ordination set out in *Edward P. 160.* the Sixth's Time, because *in contradiction to all Antiquity that part was cast out, by which a Bishop gives to Priests a Power to offer up Sacrifices, and to say Masses for the Dead and the Living.* It seems our Author knows Antiquity, as well as he doth the History of our Reformation; otherwise he had never pretended that a Form that is no elder than the 8th Century was the Practice of all Antiquity. This is so clear to all, who have examined this matter, that it is needless to urge it farther. The Silence of all ancient Authors, the Form mentioned by the 4th Council of Carthage, by the Apostolical Constitutions, and by Denis the Areopagite, and ancient *Rituels*, printed by Morinus, are such clear Proofs in this matter, that I may well save my self a farther Labour.

XXXIV. He gives another Exception against our Book of Ordination, that instead of the Oath of Submission to the Patriarch, there was another Oath prescribed to the Temporal Prince. Our Author must needs know, that the Oath which was formerly sworn to the Pope, was a plain Oath of Homage, such as Subjects swear to their Princes, by which all Bishops were bound to the Pope, and to the Royalities of St. Peter as to their Liege Lord, in the same form of Words, in which Vassals swore Homage to their Superiour Lords, and it was no wonder to see our Legislators change that into an Oath of Supremacy to our Temporal Prince. In the Primitive Times there was no such thing as either Oath or Promise of Obedience to Superiours in Ordinations; and it was not before the End of the 7th Century, that a Promise of Obedience was required, yet Charles the Great found ill Effects of this, and so got it to be condemned by the unanimous Consent of the Second Council of Chalons: And Radulphus Glaber tells us, that in the 11th Century an ill Custom was creeping in, that none was ordained Deacon, till he had first sworn Obedience to his Bishop. Among the *Rituels* published by Morinus in the 16th, there is only mention of a Promise of Submission and Obedience to the See; in the 9th *Ritual*, which he believes to be about 700 Years old, there is an Oath of Obedience indeed to the Patriarchal See, but this is far from any claim to Antiquity, since it is plain it did not begin to be exacted, till the Pope began to raise their Pretensions far beyond that of a Patriarch; and so this Oath was soon formed

Ibid: 1.
105. 1.
105. 75.
c. 13.
1040.
Pia. Gul.
Abb. Dijon.
c. 4.

to so high a strain, that our Temporal Prince whatsoever had his Subjects more strictly bound to him, than all Bishops were subjected to the Pope as their Temporal as well as their Spiritual Head, which will appear to every one, who will give himself the trouble of reading it.

P. 162.

XXXV. He quarrels our Liturgy for leaving the Oblation to God of the Holy Eucharist, as propitiatory or impetratory of any Benefits for the Living or to the Dead; contrary to the Belief of former Churches and Councils. If by former he means the Ages of Darkness, that had preceded the Reformation, then we effect no Reproach; but if he will carry this matter higher, it is false to show they had no other Notion of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, than such as we still retain, which is a Commemoration of that one Sacrifice by which we were reconciled to God and a Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving upon it, which we still retain, and according to the Spirit of the Ancient Church we use the Term *Sacrifice*. And here our Author betrays that malignancy of Spirit, which he bears our Church in accusing us for some Changes that our Reformers made in the Liturgy as if these had been such heinous things. Whereas the Changes that the *Roman Church* hath made have been of another nature, and they have so altered all their Books of Divine Offices, that if any will compare the *Ordo Romanus*, which was a Ritual of the 10th or 11th Century, with the *Missal* at present, it will appear how inconsiderable the Changes that our *Reformers* made, are, when compared to those of that Church. If any will take the Pains to examine the Books of *Ordination*, that are collected by *Mosheim*, he will see that the Prayers, which in one Age were esteemed the Form of *Ordination*, came to be considered in another but as preparatory Devotions. And that the Prayers which in one time were only recited after Orders given, were at another time looked on, as the formal Words by which they were given. Since then all Churches, chiefly that of *Rome*, have so often changed their Divine Offices, it is very unreasonable to say to reproach the Church of England for having done it once or twice in the beginning of the Reformation.

P. 176.

873

XXXVI. Our Author it seems thinks he hath a privilege to reproach our Church, in spite of the church Discoveries that can be made; to suggest that Worthy and Learned Person that answered his two Discourses concerning the *New Process*, and the *Alteration* of the *Sacrament*, had from the light given in Dr. *Baker's* History, answered the Objection he had made from the Alteration in the Article of the Sacrament concerning the Presence, a great deal of the Expression that was made in *Edward's* Sixth's Time being left out under Queen *Elizabeth*. Yet it is clear, by the Original Subscription which I myself viewed in *Jesus College Library*, that all the Clergy were of the same mind with those of King *Edward's* Time; only upon a prudential con-

consider it was not thought necessary to publish it, so that it was not cast out, but suppressed. Common Decency should have obliged our Author not to have mentioned this any more, or to have answered that which had been said upon it. But it seems with the Religion he hath got, he hath received a most indeleble degree of Impudence.

XXXVII. Our Author engaged into a long enquiry concerning the Articles of Religion that were printed in King Edward the Sixth's Time; and hath indeed offered some Things, that seem to leave it doubtful, whether they were agreed to in a Convocation, or not. But all this is a Matter of very small Importance, if these Articles were not passed in Convocation in King Edward's Reign, we are sure they were agreed too in the Convocation in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign. And it is no great matter to us, whether they are ten Years older or later, that is, whether they were agreed to in the Year 1552, or in the Year 1562. It is more likely they were agreed to in King Edward's Time, for they were printed then with that Title; and though Impostures are but too ordinary to be determined by the baldness of a Title Page, yet things are seldom Printed, as flowing from such a publick Authority, when it is known that they are the Projects of a few Heads that would impose upon the World. It cannot now be known from the Records of the Convocation, they being all burnt; But it is certain, that soon after in Queen Elizabeth's Time, these Articles were ever looked on as the Work of the Convocation in King Edward's Time. Nor is there any reason to think otherwise; for by that time, in which it is said they were made, the Bishopricks were so filled, and the Clergy were every where so compliant, that there is no reason to think that the regular way was not taken in a manner of this nature. As long as the Popish Party was the Majority, our Reformers were obliged to carry Matters by some select-ed Bishops and Divines, whose Propositions were enacted by the Civil Authority; but when the Clergy was by degrees wrought to give a more universal concurrence in the Reformation, which was done before the Year 1552, we have no reason to think that the regular Method was neglected. But it is to very little purpose to spend many words concerning a matter of small consequence, and in which there is so little certainty.

XXXVIII. Our Author sheweth how dry all his Concessions are in favour of the Civil Authority in opposition to the Papal Pretensions not only for depossing, but even for assassinating Heretical Princes in these words. *It shall here be granted (as being the Opinion of several Chancellors) that no general Council hath any Authority to make any Ecclesiastical Law, which any way intrenches upon any Civil Rights: nor any Foreign Prelate hath Authority to use a Temporal*

peral Power over Princes (which judg'd Hereticks) is still to depose them, or absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance. The King is certainly much oblig'd to our Author, who hath given him such an Assurance of enjoying his Crown and his Life. For he grants it here as he said elsewhere he would not be thought to justify the burning of Hereticks in this place. So here while he is in England, he will condemn these Treasonable Doctrines. The ground upon which he condemns them is also suitable to the Condemnation it self. For he says that this is the Opinion of several Catholicks. This was modestly expressed. For though it is true, that several of those he calls Catholicks, are of this mind, yet all Catholicks are not of it. So that the Doctrine of murdering Kings, is at least a *probable* one, and since the Decrees of the Church of Rome for the deposing of Princes, fall not only on those that are Hereticks themselves, but even on the Foes and Favourers of Hereticks, I do not see how his Majesties Life is secured. For besides the Protection and Liberty that he grants to Hereticks of his own Dominions, he hath received and encouraged the Refugees of another Prince, which is to be a Favourer of Heresy of the worst sort. So that if *Immortals* were in fashion, I do not see how our Author could defend himself against an Indictment of Treason, or at least against an Information. Our Author to let us see how wary he is in his Concessions, as he calls them, ends the Paragraph with another, *It shall be granted here.* For it is plain, he will not lose an inch of all the Papal Pretensions, but will preserve them entire to a better time.

P. 422.

* XXXIX. Our Author pretends that Queen Elizabeth's Supremacy was carried much higher, than had been granted by the former Clergy under King Henry the 8th. The Allegation is false, for the Supremacy was carried much higher under King Henry, than it was under Queen Elizabeth, who, as he would not accept of the Title of *Head of the Church*, so she explained her Supremacy, both in her own Injunctions, and in the Acts of Convocation and Parliament that followed, in so unexceptionable a manner, that our Author himself hath nothing to object to it. He seems also to insinuate, as if the King's Supremacy were asserted by us, as a Grant of the Clergy, whereas we pretend to no such thing. The civil Supremacy that we ascribe to our Princes, is founded on the Laws of God, on the Rules of Human Society, on the Laws of England, and on the Practice of the Church for many Ages; and King Henry receiv'd no new strengthening of his Title by the Act of the Clergy, which did not confer any new Authority on him, but only declared that which was already inherent in him.

XL. Our Author enters into a long Discourse to prove the Invalidity of Orders granted in our Church, which he doth so weakly, and yet has he doth all other things so sedulously, and with so much Confusion, that I have no mind to follow him in all his wandrings. He seems to question the Authority of *Suffragan Bishops*, who though they were limited as to their *Jurisdiction*, yet as to their Order, they were the same with the other *Bishops*.

The Proceedings in Queen *Mary's* Time, were too full of Irregularity and Violence, to be brought as Proofs, that the Orders given by King *Edward's* Book were not valid. In a word, the Foundation of that false Opinion of some of the Church of *Rome*, was that ever since the Time of the Council of *Florence*, the Form in which Priests Orders were conferred, was believed to be the delivering the Sacred Vessels, with a power to offer Sacrifices for the Dead and Living. So they reckoned, that we had no true Priests, since that Ceremony was struck out of our Ordinal. But the folly of all this is apparent, since that Men began to examine the Ancient Rituals; and those which have been published by *Morinus*, shew, that as this Rite is peculiar to the *Roman Church*, so it was not received before the Ninth Century. And since all Ordinations, during the first Eight Centuries, were done by the Imposition of Hands and Prayer, then there can be no reason to question our Orders, since we retain still all that the *Ancient Church* thought necessary.

As for the common Observation of our Ordinals not being enacted by Queen *Elizabeth*, before the Eighth Year of her Reign, it hath been so oft made and answered; that I am amazed to see our Author urge it any further. Would he that hath disputed so much against the Civil Authorities meddling in Matters Sacred, annul our Orders, because the Laws was not so clearly worded, with relation to that part of our Offices? The most that can possibly be made out of this, is, that the Ordinations were not quite legal; so that one might have disputed the payment of the Fruits. But this hath no relation to us, as we are a Church; in that the Book of Ordinations having been annexed to the Book of Common-Prayer in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, the reviving of the Book of Common-Prayer in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time was considered, as including the Book of Ordinations. Though its not being expressly named, this gave occasion to *Bornet* to question the validity of them in Law. Upon which the Explanatory Act passed, declaring that it had been the Intention of the Parliament to include that in the Book of Common-Prayer. So that this Act only declared the Law, but did not create any new Right.

The Author's Apology

I have now gone over all my papers, and returned in their full-
diction Book. The first of the five, the most ungrateful, and
the frequent Repetition, the many long Excursions, to very little pur-
pose, above all the various way of Reasoning, make it a very un-
grateful thing to me to write through it. And one may see how
much a Man may labour and study to very little purpose. For how
unhappy soever the Author hath been in his pains, it cannot be de-
nied but he hath been at a great deal to conceal it. But a Man that
neither sees things distinctly, nor judges well of them, the more he
tells about them he entangles himself and his Reader to much the
more. So that never was so much pain taken to tell purpose.

If our Author gives us many more Books of this kind, both as to
Sincerity and good Reasoning, he will quickly cure the World of
of the mistake in which they were concerning him.

He passed over for a Learned Man, and he had cause to think
he had not taken care to let the World see, by his many ungrateful
Essays how false a Title he hath to that Reputation which had fallen
upon him. And as for the Sincerity and good Reasoning, are of a
piece. For he hath not only shown the World the false-
hoods concerning latter times, and the ignorance of Antiquity that
appear in all his books, so when so many have been at the pains to
discover both his Mistakes and his Impostures, he would either
have excused them, or some way excused them. But it is no
wonder to see a Man that dissembled so long with God, and that
lived for nothing but to serve the World now, as he did his God for
many Years.

I pray God touch his Heart, and give him a Repentance pro-
portioned to the heinousness of his Sin, by which he hath given
so much scandal to the Antiquity of Men, who from him
must be taught to draw strange Conclusions. And he hath cer-
tainly wrought a greater Reproach on that Church to which he hath
gone over, than all the Services he can ever render to it in his life-
time, and continued writings, will be able to wipe off.

But to whom soever he hath been a Reproach, our Church hath
nothing to do. For he hath not only shown the World the false-
hoods concerning latter times, and the ignorance of Antiquity that
appear in all his books, so when so many have been at the pains to
discover both his Mistakes and his Impostures, he would either
have excused them, or some way excused them. But it is no
wonder to see a Man that dissembled so long with God, and that
lived for nothing but to serve the World now, as he did his God for
many Years.

FINIS

